

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to provide for appropriate military records for persons who, pursuant to orders, reported for military duty, but whose induction into the service was not, through no fault of their own, formally completed on or prior to November 30, 1918; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution to promote full recovery at the earliest opportunity; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 489. Resolution calling for law enforcement and protection of civil rights within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, with reference to the political and economic status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 5197. A bill for the relief of the Olson Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5198. A bill for the relief of Marjorie B. Marable; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5199. A bill for the relief of Moszes and Anna Helman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5200. A bill for the relief of Anthony (Tony) Di Ina; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1473. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Petition signed by surgeons from 15 States or more, strongly urging the adoption of universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1474. By Mr. ROCKWELL: Memorial from William C. Blair, secretary of the senate, State of Colorado, concerning the administration of the United States Forest Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1475. Also, memorial from William C. Blair, secretary of the senate, State of Colorado, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1476. Also, memorial from William C. Blair, secretary of the senate, State of Colorado memorializing the Congress of the United States to adequately support the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1477. By the SPEAKER. Petition of the Council of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1478. Also, petition of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, Chapter No. 14, CIO, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of S. 1592; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1479. Also, petition of the Retired Railway Mail Service Employees Association, petition-

ing consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of S. 896; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1480. Also, petition of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, Robert Merriman Post, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the investigation of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee by the Woods-Rankin committee; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 22, 1946

(Legislative day of Friday, January 18, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou kindly light, lead Thou us on. We grope forward with uncertain step in a tense time dark and filled with fears, as men in mad fury contend for the prizes they fain would grasp and the goals they blindly seek. The encircling gloom is about us. Help us to trust the faithful stars above us and the glow on the far horizon where the gates of dawn await the day of brotherhood. May the day star from on high arise within us, dispelling our inner darkness and so making us children of the light.

Grant us honesty in dealing with our besetting sins, humility in confessing them, and resolution in overcoming them. At this high altar in the temple of public service maintain in us the fidelity of those to whom much has been given and from whom much will be required. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

CLYDE M. REED, a Senator from the State of Kansas; EDWARD V. ROBERTSON, a Senator from the State of Wyoming; and GLEN H. TAYLOR, a Senator from the State of Idaho, appeared in their seats today.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Ellender	Kilgore
Ball	Ferguson	La Follette
Bankhead	Fulbright	Langer
Barkley	George	Lucas
Bilbo	Gerry	McCarran
Brewster	Gossett	McClellan
Bridges	Green	McFarland
Briggs	Guffey	McKellar
Buck	Gurney	McMahon
Bushfield	Hart	Maybank
Butler	Hatch	Mead
Byrd	Hawkes	Millikin
Capper	Hayden	Morse
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Murdoch
Cordon	Hill	O'Daniel
Donnell	Hoey	Pepper
Downey	Huffman	Radcliffe
Eastland	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb

Robertson	Taft	Wherry
Russell	Taylor	White
Saltostall	Thomas, Okla.	Wiley
Shipstead	Thomas, Utah	Willis
Smith	Tobey	Wilson
Stanfill	Tydings	Young
Stewart	Walsh	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. MITCHELL], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations now being held in London.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] is absent on official business as a member of the Mead committee.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations now being held in London.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent on official business as a member of the Mead committee.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

JOURNAL OF THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1946

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to amend the Journal of the proceedings of the Senate of Thursday, January 17, 1946.

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me to place something in the Record? I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to do so, but that the Senator shall not be taken off the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection—

Mr. BALL and Mr. TAFT objected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota objects.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, today the Senate of the United States finds itself in a most unenviable position in the minds of the American people. We may talk about the responsibility for that condition, but all will admit that for the Senate to be found in its present condition in this time of chaos certainly is not calculated to increase its stature in the minds of our people.

We have just emerged from the greatest war of all history, and we emerged

victorious. During the time of national peril we experienced national unity. With the coming of victory that unity vanished. We are now in a period which is so critical for our future economy that what happens now will affect the happiness and prosperity of our people. We are facing a crisis second only to that fateful day in December when the Japanese attacked at Pearl Harbor. Our entire economy is threatened, the production which is essential to carry us through the reconversion period, which started with such bright prospects, is being shut down by industrial strife.

We are walking a tightrope in our fiscal affairs, with a debt which approaches \$300,000,000,000. We are threatened with the necessity of resorting to the printing press to pay the debt, or will be driven into a period of deflation which will make it necessary for us to repudiate it.

I have in my hand a copy of today's New York Times. The headlines proclaim "Truman calls for continued price control, higher wages, labor peace, reduced budget." Another headline says "Steel mills close." Another says "Snyder asks action to bar an 'economic Pearl Harbor'." And in that situation we find that the Senate of the United States is impotent to legislate.

Mr. President, I shall not discuss the responsibility for this situation other than to say that I want the RECORD to show, for the benefit of the future historian, that the opponents of the proposed legislation are in no wise responsible for precipitating this unfortunate condition. I want the RECORD to show, Mr. President, that the opponents of the proposed legislation are not responsible for the stalemate which exists in all the business of the Senate, and which makes certain that this bitter fight will be drawn out to a conclusion, to the death or detriment of any other legislation.

With approximately 2,000,000 people out on strike, we cannot consider, nor can a committee report, any legislation to deal with that crisis. We have the remarkable situation of the press reporting the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] as being willing to have any legislation of importance considered, when his right bower on the other side of the aisle will not even permit a bill to be introduced, will not permit a committee to report, in his determination that all business shall die, even though the condition of the Nation becomes worse, unless he can force us to accept his will in the matter of the pending so-called, but misnamed, fair-employment-practice legislation.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question. I shall be more generous than the Senator.

Mr. BALL. It is not a question, exactly. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that the moment this filibuster on the reading of the Journal is concluded, and we are back on Senate bill 101, so far as I am concerned I shall be glad to have the Senate transact any business, have bills introduced, and all other routine matters disposed of. So long as the opponents persist in preventing the Senate from actually getting to

Senate bill 101, by the tactic of amending the Journal, we will see that the Senate is tied up completely.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I reiterate my statement, confirmed by the Senator from Minnesota himself, that the Senator takes the position that unless he can impose his will upon this body there shall be no legislation of any character, that no committee will be permitted even to report to the Senate a bill which would deal with any one of the serious problems confronting the Nation which are a thousand times more important than this vote-bait measure which has been forced upon the Senate at this critical hour. He will not even permit a bill to be introduced in the Senate to carry out any of the purposes of the President's message or to deal with problems which gravely affect the welfare of our people and the very stability of our form of government.

Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD show that in the midst of this storm of vituperation and abuse which is being hurled at the heads of those of us who oppose this proposed legislation we have not yet gone to the length of being willing to kill any opportunity to legislate on any other matter which might be vital to the welfare of this country.

Mr. President, those who think as does the Senator from Minnesota that this bill is of paramount importance, that it eclipses any other measure the Senate might consider, that it is of such vital consequence that we should proceed to vote on it without delay—those who think the bill is of such magnitude, of course, are justified in their positions of stalling all the machinery of government, in rendering the Congress helpless in a great national emergency. They are entitled to their views, much as we may deplore them. Those, Mr. President, who wish to prevent the Congress of the United States from dealing with any legislation on labor relations, those who might be willing even to say that no bill on the subject shall be introduced or reported by a committee, of course can rejoice and be exceeding glad, because so long as this measure is before the Senate and some Members take the attitude that they do toward those of us who are opposing it, they know that no legislation dealing with this critical condition of industrial strife and unrest can even be reported to the Senate or even introduced for the consideration of a committee.

I wish to have the RECORD show that those who are opposing this bill are not responsible for that situation in this time, when attempt is being made to drag on us over the radio and in the press by charging that we are a group of filibusterers because of the fact that we have strong convictions on this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, there is another group which can take much comfort from this situation. Those in this country who wish to generate and increase racial and class consciousness, those who wish to array section against section in this time, when unity is so important, those who wish to array one group of Americans against another group at a time when all these feelings are already rife, may well

rejoice at the situation in which the Senate of the United States now finds itself. I state again for the RECORD that those who are opposing this bill are in no wise responsible for bringing on that situation.

Mr. President, there are those of us who think, in the first place, that this bill does not address itself to any condition which exists today in the United States of America. There are those of us opposing this measure who think we see beyond this label of a fair bill a dangerous and revolutionary measure, the most far-reaching in its scope ever submitted to or considered by the American Congress. We see in this bill the power delegated to a new board or commission, which in the past has not established itself as being too responsible, to strike a death blow at the fundamental rights of private property of citizens of the United States. We see in this bill the immediate nationalization of all jobs, of all lines of business, whether it be in industry or agriculture or in commerce, of any business, whether it be conducted by a small concern or a large one; we see taken away from the employer the fundamental right to say whom he shall hire, whom he shall promote, whom he shall discharge. We see a board established which can go into the most intimate details of business of every kind, from a beauty shop to a huge commercial bank, and tell the employer whom he shall employ in positions of trust and responsibility, without regard to the opinion of the employer as to the loyalty or as to the competence of the employee.

Mr. President, we see in this bill more. We see that it will create much more unrest and strife than it can possibly remedy. We see in this period when the whole Nation is looking to the Congress to do something about the labor unrest, that this bill, instead of reaching into that situation, would create class and racial consciousness and bring about even greater labor unrest.

We see this bill as the entering wedge to complete state socialism and communism. There can be no doubt about the fact that the bill creates a vast employment agency for aliens, either those here or those who might wish to come to our shores. We know that that can be but to the detriment of native-born American citizens, who, after all, are supposed to have some remaining rights in this country.

We know, and I do not even believe that an advocate of the bill will deny, that this bill will submit American business to more badgering, to more harassment, to more annoyance than any other four pieces of legislation of which any person can possibly conceive, and that at a time when business is almost ready to give up the ghost because of being harassed and badgered by other Government agencies, by the very nature of the unrest which prevails in the country today. It is proposed to create a new agency to go into all the business houses of this Nation of every kind, shape, and character, with the right to examine books without a warrant, with the right to haul people around indiscriminately and to try them on any complaint, real

or imaginary, that discrimination has been practiced.

Furthermore we are opposed to this bill because it undertakes to regulate the tastes, the customs, the habits and the manner of life of all the American people. It is a long step forward toward that regimentation which so many people would like to see imposed in order to end the American way of life as we have known it.

That is what we see in this bill, Mr. President. Those who see these dangers inherent in the measure are not all southern Democrats. There has never been such a campaign of propaganda under false colors undertaken throughout the United States in behalf of any bill as that which has been put on in an effort to compel the Congress of the United States to take this bill without a thorough examination.

When we strip off the window dressing, it is little wonder that this campaign broke down, when it was confronted with the sound common sense of the masses of the American people. Everyone wants to be fair. The bill was labeled "fair." Proponents of the measure could say to a man, "Do you not want to be fair, and do you not want everyone else to be fair?" The first reaction of a person, of course, is to say, "Of course, I wish to be fair, and I wish everyone else to be fair." The American people are inherently and fundamentally a fair people.

The proponents of the bill use the technique of going to liberals, pseudo-liberals, and political liberals, and asking them if they do not want to be fair and support the bill. They dragooned a few of our friends into committing themselves to support it before they had looked beyond the title of the bill. In support of the bill, they could point to the fact that it was opposed by some southern Democrats. That carries a strong appeal in many sections of the country. It is said that southern Democrats are opposing it because they wish to grind down and hold in subjection the Negroes. That idea prevails in some circles, despite the fact that there is not a southern Democrat who does not know that the welfare of his people and the progress of his State are inseparably intertwined with the welfare and progress of the Negro population.

But the argument that it was a fair bill and was opposed by southern Democrats caught some of the unwary, or those who were inspired by prejudice. There was a great build-up for the bill over the radio and through the columns of the press. Every left-wing group in this country had each of its cells carefully instructed as to how to spread propaganda in support of the measure. Yesterday I referred to the message which happened to fall into my hands, instructing certain persons how to work both sides of the street, and thereby try to array Republicans against Democrats in an effort to obtain enactment of this great, "fair" bill, and commit Senators and Representatives to its support without knowing what was in it.

Despite all this, Mr. President, a Gallup poll which was taken on the seven proposals which the President most strongly emphasized in his first lengthy message

to the Congress revealed that of the seven issues submitted by the President, the so-called fair employment practice bill was the only one which did not have the support of the majority of the American people. I hold in my hand a report on that poll. It shows that the general public, in a ratio of 8 out of 10, wanted strike legislation. It shows that on the question of universal military training, that proposal, in some form, has the support of 7 out of every 10 people. It shows that by a small percentage the American people supported the President in his demand that the Congress increase the jobless benefits to \$25 a week. It shows that the majority of the American people approved a suggestion for raising the minimum wage levels. It shows that the general public was sympathetic to an increase in pay for Federal employees. The survey demonstrated that 72 percent of the people wished to see the price-control program continued. But when it comes to the FEPC, which is a misnomer, despite the campaign which has been put on all over the country, the poll shows that, notwithstanding the great pressure, by a small percentage the American people were 44 percent opposed and 43 percent in favor. So, Mr. President, in making this fight we are supporting the will of the majority of the people of the United States.

Why did the campaign for the bill fail? Why did the effort break down? The bill was mislabeled, and designed to appeal to every kind of prejudice in every section of the country outside the South. Why did it fail and break down? It failed because the supporters of the legislation made one tragic mistake. They must have had assisting them in directing their movements a lawyer who had a suspicion that the Constitution of the United States—a document which it was once considered good form to mention—was not yet quite dead. It was known that no power was given to the Federal Government to sustain such a legislative monstrosity as this. The lawyer evidently concluded that the police power of the States should be used. Conceivably it might be stretched to justify such a measure. It was decided to have the States enact laws creating fair employment practice commissions.

That was the mistake of the proponents of the bill. If that had not been done, we might have had a most difficult time obtaining hearings on the bill. If the proponents of the bill had not gone out to the grass roots where the State legislatures could look this gift horse of fairness in the mouth and see what it really was, it might have been possible to have perpetrated the legislative lynching which the Senator from Minneapolis [Mr. BALL] and others are so enthusiastically espousing. It might have been possible to have brought the bill to a vote, and to have imposed cloture in the Senate before Senators had an opportunity to explain the measure so that those of the American people who were not familiar with the bill could have an opportunity to know something about the kind of bill which was suggested.

Mr. President, I have no objection to any State legislature considering such a bill. As I have stated, there is no justification in the Constitution of the United States for such a measure. There is no police power of the Federal Government which can be properly applied to such a concoction as this. There may be some police power residing in the States, where the founding fathers intended to put the police power, which would justify the enactment of such a law. But when the supporters of the bill went before the hard-headed men who represent their people in the State legislatures, those men saw the true nature of the bill, and in practically every instance the proponents met with overwhelming defeat.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that none of the State bills was nearly so drastic in its penalties and so far-reaching in its scope as is the bill which is now before the Senate. They were much milder in their terms. But the State legislators who, as I have found from 10 years of experience in serving in the legislative body of my own State, are rather careful in looking at bills, saw the vices which were inherent in even those mild measures, and they refused to start the majority of their people on the way to bondage merely because some trickster of draftsmanship had labeled the bill a fair-employment bill.

Mr. President, they went to 20 States with this bill, and of course they selected those where they thought the opportunities for its passage would be best. They got it through in New York, although the bill which was passed in New York is not nearly so strict in its terms as is the pending bill, and it does not carry such drastic penalties as the proponents of this bill would have the Federal Government impose. But in New York they did get through a bill which was called a fair-employment-practice bill.

In the State of New Jersey they secured the passage of a bill which was labeled a fair-employment-practice bill. It did not undertake to fine and jail the citizens of New Jersey in the same measure that this bill undertakes to fine and jail all the people of the United States; but they did secure the passage of such a bill in the State of New Jersey.

The other 18 States utterly rejected any idea of compulsion. The State of Indiana directed the secretary of its department of labor to make a study of the subject in connection with the question whether there was any discrimination. We might have profited from that example. The fact that we did not do so shows how half-baked we are in dealing with these vital measures. We made no real study to determine the extent of discrimination.

In Utah a legislative investigating committee was appointed to look into the situation and see whether a constitutional bill could be drawn, whether the legislature had the power, and whether there was, in fact, discrimination in the State.

The other 16 States refused even to deal with the subject by passing any form of legislation relating to it, regardless of whether it was educational or

whether it was to provide for an investigation, and they rejected the idea of imposing a criminal penalty on their citizens on the basis of a charge so nebulous and hard to defend against as that one citizen had discriminated against another in respect to conditions of employment or in employing or in discharging.

I shall name the 16 States in which such legislation was not passed. It was not passed in the State of California; on the contrary, it was rejected by the California Legislature. However, one of the Senators from that State is the coauthor of this bill and is urging its passage by the Senate of the United States. The last time I heard anything from California they even had rules there about the right of aliens to own land, yet one of the Senators from that State is espousing a bill to create a gigantic employment agency to insure that every alien shall have a job; and I am not at all sure but that under the terms of this bill, which I shall presently discuss in detail, the Fair Employment Practice Commission would not even be given a right to go into the whole question of restrictive covenants and to say absolutely what a man might do with his land and limit the power of any person to impose a restrictive covenant in connection with the transfer of title to real estate in this Nation.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a parliamentary question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I wonder whether the Senator is going to devote his attention to a discussion of the bill or to the question of the Journal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have discussed only the bill, and I have no other purpose.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the Legislature of the State of Colorado legislation of this nature was introduced. The members of its legislative body did not think the whole fate of the world in this hour depended upon the creation of a new commission. They undoubtedly thought there were more important matters to which the Colorado Legislature could address itself. They showed better judgment than did the Senate of the United States, for in their legislature the bill was not acted upon, and it died.

The Legislature of the State of Connecticut had an opportunity to rush into this very situation which is asserted to be so critical by the sponsors of the bill. Certainly, Connecticut is a liberal State in its thought. No one can deny that fact if he has followed the results of elections there and the general trend of public life in Connecticut. But the Connecticut Legislature was not impressed with the necessity for this bill, and defeated it.

The State of Illinois, a great industrial State, had an opportunity to protect its people from all of the great unfairness and discrimination which it is said is rampant. The State of Illinois is divided very strictly on party lines, but the legislators in that State did not fall for this working-both-sides-of-the-street idea that is sought to be applied in the Senate of the United States, and they showed their good judgment by defeating the measure.

The State of Kansas had an opportunity to enact legislation on this subject.

The States of Maryland, Massachusetts, and Michigan refused to enact legislation on this subject. They are all great industrial States, and if there was any great epidemic of discrimination against any persons entitled to protection under the law, certainly the legislators of those States, who had some faint excuse under the police power which is vested in the States under our Constitution, would have taken action to protect those who live within their confines.

The State of Minnesota had an opportunity to enact legislation on this subject. I regret that the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who has been most zealous in attempting to cram this bill down our throats, who has insisted that we discuss the bill, is not now present on the floor of the Senate, because I am undertaking at least to lay the groundwork of my discussion by showing why the majority of the people of this Nation are opposed to having the Senate deal with a measure of this kind in this very critical hour. The State of Minnesota, where the Senator's candidate for President of the United States is supposed to exert great power and influence, and where the Senator from Minnesota himself is recognized as a great liberal, found that its State legislature had too good judgment to undertake to invade every little business enterprise in Minnesota and tell the proprietor of that enterprise how he should operate his business and whom he should hire and whom he should promote. Ah! The Senator from Minnesota would do well to be in the legislative body of his State objecting to anything which any person in his State might think important to the welfare of the people of Minnesota, rather than sitting here and tying the hands of the Senate of the United States, rendering all the machinery of government absolutely impotent in this hour of great crisis.

Mr. President, to my surprise I have found that the great State of New Mexico has had an opportunity to pass legislation such as this, and I find that the legislature of that State had too much good common sense to invade the rights of their people.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know New Mexico and I know the legislature did that. But it was not because of the common sense of the legislature; but as in many other States, they neglected to pass laws which would deal with human beings.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well. I know something about the influence within his State of the Senator from New Mexico. I had the pleasure of visiting New Mexico, as I recall, in September 1944. It was my high privilege to go about that State with the Senator from New Mexico. I had the pleasure of meeting many fine people. I went back into the remote vastness of the mountains where live some of those whom the Senator from New Mexico represents. I have never seen men and women walk up to a public official and shake his hand with more adoration in their eyes than I saw in the eyes of the constituents of the

Senator from New Mexico. They considered it almost a great honor to touch the hem of his garment. The Senator from New Mexico, instead of using the great influence which he has in that State—it is a State which has a larger percentage of Mexican and Hispanic peoples than any other State in the Union—for the purpose of affording them protection under the police powers of the State of New Mexico, says, "No, I will impose my will from Washington. I will design a broom that has a handle of sufficient length for me to stand in the Capitol of Washington and sweep out a bad situation in the backyard of New Mexico."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is possible that the failure of the Legislature of New Mexico to pass a law similar to the one which is provided for in the bill now before us, is my fault. I did not interfere with a single member of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that the Senator from New Mexico is trying to interfere with a great many Members of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I belong to the Senate of the United States as much as does the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would fight for the protection of the Senator from New Mexico and for his rights as earnestly as I am fighting for my own.

Mr. CHAVEZ. However, I may say that I did not believe it was proper for a United States Senator to tell any individual member of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico what he should do with regard to any legislative proposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let the Senator take care of New Mexico. That is what I am asking him to do. I am asking him to take care of New Mexico and keep his hands off of other States and other people who do not want such legislation as that which is being proposed here.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I represent the State of New Mexico, but I am also a Senator of the United States. In my humble opinion I think it is time to quit legislating for sections. I think it is time for the United States Senate to legislate for all the people of the United States without exceptions, and differentiations with regard to any State legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, there are many persons who take the position that the States have no rights in this new day. I can recall the time when if an idea had been advanced on the floor of the Senate that such a bill as the one now pending could stand the test of constitutionality, the Senator advancing the idea would have been laughed out of the Senate. I think that the States still have some rights. I know that the Constitution provides that all rights not delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the people. It is the people of the United States for whom I am fighting today. I am fighting for their right to live, their right to conduct their humble businesses as they see fit to conduct

them, without the blighting hand of Federal bureaucracy coming down to harass and annoy them and eventually to destroy private business.

I repeat, Mr. President, that if conditions in New Mexico are terrible, the New Mexico Legislature can deal with them. I do not know a single member of that body, but I refuse to believe that they are purblind to any condition of discrimination which may exist as bearing down thousands of citizens in the State of New Mexico. I believe they are loyal American citizens. I believe that if they thought, as does the Senator from New Mexico, that the entire good-neighbor policy of this country depended on such legislation as is now being proposed, they would enact legislation of that nature. I believe that if they had thought it was necessary to create an employment bureau, as this bill proposes to do, in order that aliens may secure employment, the Legislature of New Mexico would have provided for that end. The Senator from New Mexico has been swept away by his feelings, and has greatly magnified the seriousness of a condition which does not exist to any considerable extent within his State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not quite understand. Did the Legislature of New Mexico have before it last year a similar proposal?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; in 1945 the legislature had before it a similar bill which it did not pass.

Mr. HILL. Did either house of the legislature pass it?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know as to that. The Senator from New Mexico could answer that question better than I.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The senate voted on the bill and defeated it.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is my understanding that after it was defeated in the senate it was not considered by the other house.

Mr. President, I hope that we may have a facsimile of such action in this body.

The State of Ohio defeated legislation of this nature. The great industrial States of Pennsylvania and Rhode Island had an opportunity to protect their citizens against what some Senators would have us believe is the great wave of discrimination which is breaking down all commerce, affecting the national security, endangering the general welfare, and crippling production—dangers which are set forth in the preamble of the bill which is now before the Senate. The legislators of those States were too smart to get caught by any such trick title as that which is used in connection with a fair employment bill which is so far-reaching in its powers and in the invasion of the rights of the individual as that which is being proposed today in the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, so long as the Senator from Georgia feels that the State of Rhode Island and the other States to which he has referred rejected the bill in their respective State legislatures, does he not believe that it would be proper to allow the men in the United

States Senate who represent State constituencies to say whether they favor such legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to allow any Senator to state whether he favors such a bill, and why he favors it. I merely wish to say that there can be no such condition in this country as that which is set forth in the preamble to the bill. I refuse to impeach all members of State legislatures of this Nation as being derelict in their duty in considering the rights of their constituents. For 4 years I was speaker of the house of representatives of the legislature of my State. I may say that the members of the State legislative body in which I was honored to serve were and are just as zealous in their desire to serve the public welfare as is any Senator of the United States. They were interested in the rights of their constituents even though many times they were few in number. Mr. President, I often found that they were not so easily swayed by political considerations as I have feared some other persons were swayed.

I continue reading from the list of States to which I referred. Let us consider the State of Washington. I ask all who label themselves liberals to ponder the fact that the State of Washington, which is certainly not a reactionary State, had this matter up in its general assembly, and the legislators of that State were not convinced that there was any immediate danger that all business and industry in the State of Washington would collapse if they did not rush in and create a new commission to invade and destroy the rights of private property.

The State of West Virginia and the State of Wisconsin are also States which are considered to be liberal in their outlook. There were times when at least the State of Wisconsin called itself progressive. The legislatures of those States had before them legislation creating a so-called fair employment practices commission, and in the better judgment of the men composing the legislatures of those States—and I reiterate that they are as interested in the welfare of their constituents as are United States Senators—they refused to pass a bill which was as revolutionary and as identical in its purport as is the proposed legislation now being considered by this body.

Bear in mind also, Mr. President, that none of those bills was so sweeping in its terms and so drastic in its penalties as the bill which we are asked to pass without even a full discussion.

So, Mr. President, we may not be in the majority in the Senate of the United States at the present time, but we can look at the record of what has transpired in the legislatures from California to Connecticut and assure ourselves that we are at least standing shoulder to shoulder with the best thought of the members of the State legislatures, who have time to consider legislation carefully, who are not burdened down with other duties, and who are not so susceptible in some cases to various pressure groups. They are close to conditions.

I endeavor as diligently as I know how to stay close to my people back home,

but in the last 5 or 6 years it has been well-nigh impossible. Our duties require our constant attendance here in the confused and chaotic and pressure-ridden atmosphere of the city of Washington. We sometimes cannot see the forest for the trees here in Washington; nor see the facts for the fumbler and for the lobbyists who are here.

Mr. President, the members of the State legislatures, wherever they may be, are infinitely closer to their people and are far more intimate with the public pulse and with what is transpiring in their States than the Members of the Senate can be. So when we hear this cry of "wolf, wolf," of great discrimination, when there are so many domestic strikes, depriving the United States of its capacity for production, endangering the national security and the general welfare, and affecting adversely commerce, let us go back to the "grass roots" of the States where the people really live and see how much truth there is in such high-flown phrases and words as we constantly hear.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before the Senator leaves the question of the action taken by various States, let me inquire if any of the States in the South refused to pass such legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, not a single Southern State refused to pass legislation of this character. Of course, I must say that I do not undertake to claim for them any credit on that account. Our people had the good judgment not even to consider invading the rights of individuals and taking away the property rights of business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Southern States had declined to act, would they have constituted a majority of the States which refused to pass such legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. The States that refused to act constituted a majority of all. Of course, if the 11 Southern States had acted there would have been a great majority of States acting against it. However, of all the 48 States the legislation was introduced in only 20 and it was defeated in 18, so that the Senator can figure out the percentage of the number of State legislatures that thought it worth while to enact even a much milder bill than the one we now have before us or even to consider or introduce such a bill.

Mr. President, I say that this bill is here just as the result of the activities of pressure groups. I do not say that every man who is supporting this bill is a Communist, because I know that some of my good friends have been misguided and misled and have fallen into the trap. But I do say, Mr. President, without the slightest fear of contradiction, that every Communist and every Socialist in this land, wherever he may live, is ardently supporting this bill. There are reasons for that. If the desire is to nationalize industry here is the chance. It is not strange that the Daily Worker should take up the cudgels day after day in behalf of this bill. If I were one of those who operate that periodical, so would I, because I know what will hap-

pen if we ever let the Federal Government invade the little business enterprises and little farms of this country with such a scheme as this. In the very nature of things it will have to result in the nationalization of all industry and business.

Mr. President, as I say, the Gallup poll showed a majority of the people were against it, because, realizing that this bill perhaps was unconstitutional, in going out to the States with this proposition they went out to the "grass roots." Of course there are thousands of others in the country who do not understand the bill; and that is the purpose of this discussion.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if later in his remarks he intends to discuss the manner in which the Fair Employment Practice Committee carried on its work in 1944 and 1945, and further if he intends to go into the hearings which the Committee on Appropriations held in 1945? I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia further, since he has referred to the socialization of industry, if he intends to bring out the statement which Mr. Ross, who is, or was, the chairman of the Fair Employment Practice Committee made to the Appropriations Committee in answer to a question by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who inquired:

There have been more correspondingly—

Referring to cases of discrimination—in the North than there have been in the South.

Mr. Ross answered "Yes."

There were very few complaints against the hiring of Negro labor in the South because the southern people understood Negro labor.

I am wondering if the Senator intends to refer to the statement of the chairman of the committee himself.

Mr. RUSSELL. I recall the testimony to which the Senator from South Carolina adverts. I shall discuss this bill with the utmost frankness, for I always try to be frank. As a part of the technique to force this bill through the Senate, I know that those who are going to Senators and insisting that this bill is necessary in order to protect the rights of Jews and Negroes are saying that if a Senator on this floor in discussing the bill which has been brought forward by this pressure group mentions either one of them he must be labeled as being anti-Semitic or as being anti-Negro. That is a part of the technique, working both sides of the street, playing Republicans against Democrats and trying to muzzle full discussion of it. While the proponents themselves, in discussing it, say it is designed for certain purposes, if we mention any of those purposes which they have brought forward we are immediately attacked as being anti-Semitic and anti-Negro. I shall discuss it frankly, but I shall not go into any detail about the Negro question today, I may say to the Senator from South Carolina, because I have another day's speech, in which I hope to discuss that situation.

So I hope the Senator will forgive me for not going into it today. I do not intend to mention the Negro situation other than to say that I think a Negro drug-gist in Harlem is just as much entitled to refuse to hire a Japanese-American as a pharmacist as a white man in Atlanta, Ga., operating a drug store, is entitled to select another white man instead of a Negro as a pharmacist. That is equality all over the United States. Much is said about minorities. Under our Constitution all minorities are supposed to be afforded equal rights and not special privileges, and the latter, as I say, is what this bill proposes to confer.

I shall not discuss the claim that the bill is necessary for the Jews. Some of my constituents who are Jews have talked to me about it, and they say they see no need for it. I think it would be very manifest from an economic survey that the Jews, in proportion to their numbers in the United States, control as many employment opportunities as any other group, if not more. Certainly there is no necessity for passing the bill to protect them in any of their economic rights, or what are asserted to be immunities, in this legislation.

I shall not go into that problem at this time. I propose to discuss the bill as it applies to the entire Nation. At a later date I may discuss some of the aspects of the question which the Senator from South Carolina raised. In fact, I intend to do so.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question, inasmuch as he has said the bill affects the entire Nation, and it will, indeed, affect everyone. The thought I had in mind at the time I interrupted the Senator was that it would affect the entire Nation. The distinguished Senator from Georgia must be well acquainted with the fact that a railroad case was brought against the southern railroads, but not all the railroads.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct, and in my other speech I shall discuss that matter in some detail. I wish to say, however, that in my discussion today I am not dealing with this question as a sectional question. I realize the studied effort that has been made to treat the bill as a sectional measure, but the issue is not sectional, and the opposition to the bill is not confined to southerners.

I hold in my hand a letter from the National Association of Retail Grocers, whose general offices are on North Michigan Avenue in Chicago, Ill., who are asserting their right to conduct their little grocery stores as they see fit, without having the long arm of the Federal Government reach down and tell them whom they may hire, whom they may fire, and whom they may put in charge of the cash register.

I have here a resolution which was adopted by this association of grocers on this subject. This is what they have to say about it:

Whereas the so-called—

Even they know it is just a "so-called"—

Whereas the so-called fair employment practice bill, S. 101, would, if enacted—

1. Virtually eliminate managerial discretion in hiring, promoting, laying off, and discharging employees;

2. Establish a permanent Federal bureaucracy which, through its agents, would act as prosecutor, judge, and jury, such agents being authorized by the bill to enter private places of business and conduct searches and examine and copy records without a search warrant or any showing of public cause;

3. Deprive employers of most of their rights on appeal to the courts from any conviction of discrimination;

4. Expose employers to endless harassment and litigation by disgruntled job seekers and to future liabilities, the existence of which they did not suspect and for which they made no provision; and

Whereas the announced objectives of this legislation can be advanced most effectively through education and the voluntary promotion of mutual understanding and good will between all groups of Americans:

Resolved, That the National Association of Retail Grocers vigorously and actively oppose the enactment of this or any similar legislation; further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress and, together with additional information on the subject, to all State and local secretaries of affiliated associations.

Mr. President, if I had not stated that this was a resolution passed by the National Association of Retail Grocers, who have their little stores on the street corners in the East and in the West, a person hearing me read that would have said it was merely the objection of some southern Democrat.

When we expose this bill, when we bring its iniquities out into the full light of the day, we find that 90 percent of the American people, whatever may be their business, are likewise opposed to it. In opposing the proposed legislation we are protecting the rights of all Americans everywhere. I could read at great length the list of other bodies, which are in no wise southern in their character, which are opposed to the bill.

As an example, let us hear what was said by the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio, in opposition to the so-called fair employment bill. It discusses and analyzes the bill sufficiently to refute the idea that there is any necessity for it, or that there is any precedent for it, pointing out how oppressive it would be, what unusual powers it would vest in an irresponsible commission, the members of which the President could not even remove when he had appointed them, even though they had the power to issue a mandatory order to the President of the United States. The bill proposes to establish a commission which can issue orders to the President of the United States, and he would have no right to question them, but would have to carry them out. I shall show that in a few moments.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may report two short resolutions?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall yield for any purpose that will not prejudice my right to the floor, but I shall refuse to yield to anything that will take me off the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall feel constrained to object.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to emphasize again, for the benefit of the Record, that

the opponents of the proposed legislation are not those taking the position that no bill can even be introduced, that no report of a committee can even be received, unless we are willing to swallow whole the will of those who would impose this monstrosity on the American people.

Now, Mr. President, I shall proceed to the reading of this quotation from the resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio. They talk about the objectives.

The method proposed for accomplishing the objective is to coerce the employer, labor union, or agency of the Federal Government to recognize certain principles of conduct and to establish certain social relations which are necessarily incident to the employment of persons. We recognize that the proponents of the bill say that there is no attempt therein to bring up the question of social equality. However, the employment of persons necessarily involves social distinctions both from the standpoint of the employees and the employer, and such distinctions, often unfortunate and odious, are nevertheless not capable of elimination by legislation and coercive methods.

This legislation involves the creating of a new Federal bureau and the appointment of five commissioners who will constitute the administrative, executive, and judicial board under the Fair Employment Practice Act.

The bureau will be organized throughout the entire country for the purpose of policing industry and enforcing the act.

Mr. President, that is not the statement of a southern Democrat. It is the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce analyzing this bill.

The Commission will be empowered to designate one of its members or designate any number of agents, any one of whom could be empowered to conduct trials against employers anywhere in the land. There is no limit to the number of such agents who could be appointed.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does that mean, may I ask the Senator, that the culprit could be dragged as far as Washington for trial?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this bill creates perambulatory kangaroo courts which can drag an employer to any place in the United States they wish. That is one of the threats held over the head of American business, of the American employer, of the American farmer who employs more than six individuals, to make sure that he takes care of all aliens in his employ to the detriment of American citizens who might be seeking work.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, agents of the Commission can conduct trials against an employer anywhere in the land.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hill in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILEY. I was interested in what the distinguished Senator from Georgia just said. There is one thing I should like to have him explain. Suppose a busi-

nessman employed more than six persons, and he decided to employ A instead of B, and that then the kangaroo court of which the Senator speaks went into action and found that B was discriminated against and should have the job. Is there any provision in the bill to protect A?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not the slightest on earth. I shall go into that subject in some detail when I undertake to show that instead of preventing discrimination, this bill in itself provides a violent discrimination in favor of the groups it mentions, and that it creates a situation which makes it certain that in the matter of employment and in the matter of lay-off the employer will not discharge one of the minority groups or he will not employ one of the majority groups because he knows that the Commission would immediately call him before this court, in which he has no chance, where he cannot have trial by a jury of his peers, where there are no rules of evidence, where hearsay evidence or anything may be introduced against him. That prospect, of course, means that the employer will retain the alien to the detriment of the returning veteran who may be looking for employment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. As I understand, the courts have held that once a man is an employee, if he strikes, that does not ipso facto dissociate him from the employment. Am I correct about that?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that the courts have gone quite that far. I might say that I would not be at all surprised if they have. I hope the Senator will not ask me about the position of the Supreme Court because the Senator knows that one of the distinguished members of the Supreme Court said just a few days ago that decisions rendered by the Supreme Court were like a one-way ticket on a railroad that was good for 1 day only. There once was a time when men entered law offices in order that they might study and acquaint themselves with great legal principles, but now the man who has the latest edition of the newspaper or who has a portable radio is much better prepared for the practice of law than his brother who is only armed with a good law library. The Supreme Court cannot keep up with its decisions, and I must confess I have lost my zest for reading Supreme Court decisions of recent date.

Mr. WILEY. I am leading up to a question, if the Senator will yield further. I assume the Senator will agree with me that there is no law to the effect, nor has there ever been a decision which held, that until employment takes place there is any restriction upon the employer to determine whom he shall hire.

Mr. RUSSELL. If property rights in this Nation mean anything there cannot be such restriction under the Constitution of the United States, because that is certainly an essential part of property rights. That is my own view. As I stated before, I do not know what the Supreme Court would hold on this question. The bill undertakes to give to those mentioned in it, whether the individual be an alien or whether he be a Communist, a vested

right of employment. That is what the bill does. It establishes a board to enforce that vested right in the individual to have a job.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Now we are coming to the point I was trying to make. There is no question of a contract of employment until an agreement to hire is entered into between the employer and the employee.

Mr. RUSSELL. There never has been in the America we have known. There might be in the new America which the sponsors of this bill would bring upon us. Under it, if the individual can associate himself with the four definitions in the bill, with the four categories in the bill, he has a vested right in employment.

Mr. WILEY. Then, one of the issues is whether or not we are going to attempt to make effective legislation which is going to say to the employer, whether he be a farmer, merchant, businessman, professional man, or what not, "This individual you cannot hire, but this individual you must hire."

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the practical effect of the bill; that is unquestionably the effect of the bill, and that is the reason I am asserting that it is absolutely destructive of all private property, and will result in the absolute nationalization of all industry and of all jobs. There is no way to avoid that conclusion. Lincoln said the Nation could not exist half free and half slave, and certainly private business in this country could not exist if it were three-fourths slave and one-fourth free.

Mr. President, we were talking about perambulatory courts. There is no limit to the number of agents who may be appointed. The statement I shall now read from the analysis of the bill made by the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, I may say to my distinguished friend the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], applies to the question he raised, and answers it:

Witnesses could be subpoenaed and forced to attend from any place in America. The qualifications of such one-man courts would be determined, not by Congress—

No, Mr. President, the qualifications would not be determined by the Congress. We would send them forth clothed with all the power of the Congress, and tell them, "You do not even have to be lawyers. You do not have to know a rule of evidence, or observe a rule of evidence." We would have no power to determine their qualifications. They would be determined by the commission, in accordance with its rule-making power.

The Commission or any of its agents—

The unlimited army which the bill would create—

could, according to section 9 of the bill, have the power to enter private business places and there conduct searches, examine and copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against by such agency.

In the old days our misguided fathers thought that the power of search and seizure should be very carefully restrained. They undertook to do so in the Constitution of the United States,

before that document was discarded in the Halls of the Senate. If we pass this bill, we shall delegate unlimited power of search without the slightest scintilla of process of law.

I now recur to the statement of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce:

The bill makes no requirement as to probable cause for such search or the need for a search warrant. If the victim should "willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere" with such a search he would thereby become subject to fine and imprisonment.

That is a pretty accurate description of the bill. I should like to conclude with the closing statement of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. Bear in mind that this is an organization in Cleveland, Ohio. The statement from which I am reading is not the opinion of a despised southern Democrat.

The bill is a departure from the traditional American system of free enterprise with respect to the right that has always been enjoyed by employers to use their own sound judgment and discretion in selecting loyal and capable employees. Under the American system of competitive free enterprise, a man has been able to excel and make progress because of his ability to judge men and surround himself with employees whom he could trust, and who could produce more and better services. It is through that system of competition and improvement that private enterprise has succeeded in America when it has failed in other countries.

That is a statement from a representative business group in the great State of Ohio. They realize, as well as do certain southern Democrats, that this bill aims at the heart of our system of free enterprise a blow which will absolutely destroy the American system which we have known, and regiment our people in a totalitarian state.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. If this bill should become law, may I ask the Senator if the natural implication of the law would not be an ever-increasing flood of inspectors and examiners over the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is absolutely no limit to the number of persons who might be selected by the Commission to go forth and harass, annoy, badger, and drive out of business all those who have made this country great through the operation of a free system of agriculture, industry, and enterprise generally. There is no limit.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Would these examiners, inspectors, or whatever they may be called, be given the authority and power to decide when to arrest the culprits?

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill uses the oblique technique of the totalitarian advocates. The examiner himself would not have the power to arrest. He would not need any warrant. He would go into a man's place of business and say, "I am going through your books to find out why you did not employ John Jones instead of Bill Smith to help you in the shop or to help you gather your wheat

crop last week." A farmer might say, "I do not keep any books. The few memoranda which I have are my private affair, and you cannot see them." If the examiner showed his credentials as an examiner for this irresponsible Commission and the farmer still refused to show the examiner his books, or to furnish him with copies, the farmer could then be haled before the court and sent to jail for 1 year or fined \$5,000, or both. That is the provision of the bill.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILEY. Suppose a farmer had a family of seven, and regarded them as employees, paying them wages. Nowadays that is about the only type of farmer who is really getting ahead, because farmers cannot hire labor.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. Suppose the farmer pays the members of his family wages, thus creating the relationship of employer and employee. Is it the Senator's opinion that such a farmer would be subject to the act?

Mr. RUSSELL. Any time he had more than six persons in his employ he would be bound by the act, just as much as the United States Steel Corp. would be. If he had more than six persons working for him on his farm, he would be just as much subject to the provisions of the act as would any other enterprise in the country.

Mr. WILEY. Suppose a hospital employed more than six nurses. Would it be subject to the act?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course it would. I think there is no question about it.

Mr. WILEY. How about a clinic?

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe it would be subject to the act. There is absolutely no exception. The bill undertakes to apply to any type of business.

Mr. WILEY. Suppose a legal firm employed six or more lawyers.

Mr. RUSSELL. In that case I do not know whether any attempt would be made to enforce the act. However, if the legal firm had a case outside the confines of the State it would undoubtedly be subject to the provisions of the act, or if its activities affected the sum total of the flow of commerce, it would be subject to the act. In a farm case the Supreme Court held that even though the goods never left the farm, they affected commerce and brought a farm under the commerce clause. But the example which the Senator cites is a rather close case. Perhaps the lawyer would be the only man who might escape. Perhaps a church might escape. I have considered that question, and I do not know that a church would be held to be in interstate commerce, even though it had more than six employees. Of course, the pastor would be prevented from speaking over the radio. If he spoke over the radio he would be brought under the provisions of the bill. But so long as the pastor stayed off the radio I think perhaps a church would be exempt from the operations of the law, even though it might employ more than six persons.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILEY. Take the case of an ordinary retail store which employs more than six persons, and necessarily buys its merchandise from outside the State. Would it come within the purview of the bill if it should become law?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that that question has been directly determined by the courts. I know that the courts have specifically held that a wholesale merchant who dealt in goods which might have been shipped to him from without the State was engaged in interstate commerce. That has been clearly established; and by implication, with the present tendency of the Supreme Court to play on the Constitution as on an accordion, stretching it out and drawing it in in order to pipe a tune which happens to meet the mood of the day, I think there is no question that the Supreme Court would hold that the business of a retail grocer affected interstate commerce.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am quite sure the question has been specifically decided.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not surprised.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; it has been decided by the Supreme Court.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the Senator's absence I stated that I have stopped following the decisions of the Supreme Court. One member of that body said the other day that its decisions were like a one-way ticket, good only for a certain day, and that the doctrine of caveat emptor applied. I also stated that a man used to think he needed a good law library in order to practice law, but now he needs to subscribe to a daily newspaper and to have a good radio, in order to keep up with the latest construction of the law by the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I repeat that the report from which I have been reading, which points out the iniquities and shortcomings of the bill, did not initiate with me; it comes from the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio, a business group in Cleveland.

Now I wish to refer briefly to the situation of the unions in respect to this measure. I wish to refer to a labor union which was not operating in the South, but, as I understand, was operating in California. In that union there was a system of having an auxiliary union for the benefit of one of the minority groups which this bill seeks to undertake to protect. There was no discrimination in the auxiliary unions. It was provided that there should be no discrimination against the members of the union in regard to hire, tenure, or conditions of employment. However, the FEPC which has been in existence, even with its modified powers held that that was discriminatory. They could not prove that one individual worker had been discriminated against in the union, but they decided that discrimination was possible—not that discrimination had occurred, but that discrimination was possible—and they ordered the union to change its form.

Representatives of the union came to Washington and told the Congress that it was impossible for the union to comply with the order of the committee and continue to maintain the organization, that the friction which would result would be calamitous to the welfare of the Negroes, the industry involved, and the public. The union has offered to the Negroes the same facilities as those which are possessed by the white public; but the union was told, "Oh, no; that is discrimination," and it was ordered to desist.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. I interrupt only because I am obliged to leave the floor for a brief time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to thank the Senator for his faithful attendance.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to obtain the Senator's interpretation of some of the language appearing on page 7, under subparagraph (b). The language to which I refer is—

Whenever it is alleged that any person has engaged in—

The offense at which the act is aimed.

How does the Senator interpret the words "whenever it is alleged"? In other words, by whom must it be alleged? Must it be the person who is affected by the act which is complained of, or may anyone and everyone, with or without an interest in the matter, file such an allegation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am of the opinion, and I intended to state it before I concluded my discussion, that this misnamed Commission which some persons propose to vest with all the power of the Federal Government, and even the power to discharge the President of the United States, could initiate any movement of its own. If it wished to drive any man out of business, for any purpose on earth, it would have a right to arrest him and badger him and drag him all over the country to kangaroo courts, where the Commission would sit as judge, jury, and prosecutor—all in one.

Mr. WHITE. Let me ask another question. How must the allegation be made? Must it be made in writing? Must it be sworn to? Would a letter be sufficient, or would a telephone call suffice? Ordinarily one would say that when a process might land a man in jail, some of the formalities incident to the initiation of a criminal proceeding would have to be observed. But in the pending measure I do not see any provision regarding the form in which the allegation must be put—whether it must be in writing, whether it must be sworn to, whether it must be sworn to by the party who is suffering because of the alleged offense, or whether it is wide open to anyone.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, Mr. President, the point raised by the Senator from Maine, a careful legislator, shows just the trouble we get into here every time the pressure groups rush in with a bill and say it must be passed immediately, and Senators unwittingly commit themselves to all kinds of vicious legislation. Under this bill, as I under-

stand it, the Commission, under the powers which it is supposed we would delegate to them, could say that an anonymous telephone call that Wallace White, a businessman in Maine, was discriminating against a minority group, would be sufficient to require him to submit to investigation by them, and they could send to his place of business one of their horde of examiners, who would be allowed to go through the books of the concern—all on the basis of an anonymous telephone call—to determine whether Wallace White had been guilty of such discrimination. There cannot be any question about that, because the bill is silent as to procedure. We would delegate to the Commission, in addition to granting it such powers, even the right to discharge the President of the United States, as I shall show before I conclude. In express terms we would give the Commission the power to write their own ticket as to procedures, as to method, as to the length to which they might go, without any legislative standard, without any protection whatever of the rights of individuals. Mr. President, this bill marks the day when the Congress of the United States is asked to say that all individual rights in America are perished, are gone—as they will be if we pass such a bill as this.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question in respect to the subparagraph to which I have referred.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield again.

Mr. WHITE. It provides that any agent or agency, without giving any definition as to who or what the agent or agency shall be—

Shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person—

In other words, the person complained of—

a complaint stating the charges in that respect and containing a notice of hearing before the Commission or a member thereof, or before a designated referee, agent, or agency at a place therein fixed—

And so forth. There is no provision in the proposed statute, as I take it, regarding where this initial hearing upon the complaint against an employer shall be held. There is no requirement that it shall be in the place where the alleged offense was committed. There is no provision that it shall be in the jurisdiction or locality in which the complainant lives, or in which the person complained of lives; but, as I see it, again it is wide open, and a man or a business concern in New Jersey against whom a complaint was filed might be called to California for the hearing upon the initial charges. Is that the Senator's interpretation?

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no question whatever about it. No, Mr. President; when we decided that we would take up this bill—at least, some Members of the Senate hoped they had decided it, and they tried to take it up—we said that not only would we abolish the old Anglo-Saxon idea, which we thought was sound and salutary, of giving a man a jury trial on any charge, even a nebulous charge, which might exist only in the mind of some person, but

the person complained of would also be denied the old right of trial in the vicinage. That old, long-established right would be taken away from him. I invite the attention of the Senator from Maine to the bottom of page 6, section 9. The Senator will find that a person complained of could be taken to one hearing at Salem, Oreg., and subsequently he could be moved for a second hearing to Washington, D. C., and then he could be tried at a third hearing in New Orleans, La., according to this monstrosity, which undertakes to set up Soviet methods, rather than our old Anglo-Saxon, constitutional methods of dealing with those who are charged with being guilty of an offense.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Page 7, paragraph (d), provides for a hearing before the Commission, or before an agent or agency of the Commission, and then it provides as follows:

The Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist—

And so forth. That is a common order and is well-recognized. I think we would all understand what was meant by an order to cease and desist. But the language continues near the top of page 8 as follows:

And to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees with or without back pay.

Are there any limits provided for anywhere in the bill as to this affirmative action which the Commission may take? Two things are enumerated. The language states, "including reinstatement or hiring of employees," but that language is preceded by the general language "to take such affirmative action * * * as will effectuate the policies of this act." Is it not difficult to think of anything that under this general language would be beyond the power of the Commission?

Does the Senator accord with that view?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this bill undertakes to write a blank check to do anything to American business the Commission may see fit. There is no power of which a man could conceive that could be vested in any plenary board which is not vested in this so-called Commission under the terms of this bill. It holds in its hands the matter of life and death of free enterprise in this Nation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In paragraph (c) it is provided that any person named in the complaint shall appear for trial. Then in lines 3 and 4—

Mr. RUSSELL. To what page is the Senator referring?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Page 7, the same page to which the Senator from Maine has referred.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. On page 8, in line 4, the language authorizes the taking of such affirmative action as will effectuate

the policies of this act. There is no limitation placed upon the action which may be taken. Whatever the Commission decides to be necessary to effectuate the policies of this act it may do. The Commission has wide-open authority, even going to the extent of capital punishment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite sure that the sponsors of this bill would be willing to give the Commission power of life and death over every citizen of the United States. The bill is replete with methods of sovietism and communism, and I do not think that any protection is afforded under the bill to our form of government.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I invite the Senator's attention to page 2 of the bill, section 3, reading as follows:

Sec. 3. (a) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer within the scope of this act—

(1) To refuse to hire any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Is it the Senator's belief that because of that provision people who are not citizens of the United States are protected by this bill, and that an employer could be prosecuted under the act for refusing to hire one who was not an American citizen?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator was called off the floor and was not present when I stated that one of the purposes back of this entire scheme is to create a gigantic employment bureau for the purpose of inviting aliens to our shores and giving them preference of employment over American citizens, including returned veterans.

Mr. President, I wish to proceed with my discussion of the bill, and speak in some detail with respect to the terms of the bill.

I point out first that the bill undertakes to create an entirely new and independent commission. I doubt, Mr. President, whether there is a Member of the Congress, be he Democrat, Republican, or Progressive, who, when returning to his home State and talking to his people, did not complain about the number of bureaus and commissions which had been and were being established in our Government. I know that most of us have conversed with constituents who were irritated by this expanding bureaucracy. Cases were called to our attention, whether we were Republicans, Democrats, or Progressives, which caused us to tell our constituents that we wanted to be able to do something in order to circumscribe the unbridled power of the great bureaucracy which has grown up in Washington.

The platforms of the party of our Republican brethren have inveighed against this great bureaucracy and the creation of new agencies of Government. Yet we find some Republicans supporting this bill, which is designed to create a new superbureaucracy to harass, annoy, and disorganize the American people in an effort to regulate and control their habits and manners of life.

So, Mr. President, in the first place the bill would create a new bureau. Per-

sons who are interested in the passage of this bill are not willing to allow any of the old established agencies of government to take over this monumental police force. They are not willing that any of the old agencies of government which have had experience in dealing with governmental matters and which might exercise some restraint, should undertake to handle the vast powers which the Congress is asked to delegate under this bill. The Labor Department would not be satisfactory; the National Labor Relations Board would not be satisfactory, and the FBI, because it is known to exercise some degree of fairness, would not be satisfactory. The sponsors of the bill would not risk the Department of Justice, which has long been a model agency in looking after the rights of the people of the United States. None of the agencies or departments to which I have referred would be satisfactory to the sponsors of the bill. Why? Because, as I shall show, those agencies or departments might feel constrained to exercise some restraint in using some of the vast powers which would be delegated under the bill, and not aid in communizing and socializing our system of government.

Mr. President, note how carefully the rights of the individual are diverted away from even a speaking acquaintance with the courts. Senators may say what they please, but the American people have some respect for their judicial system. Whether the judge happens to be a Republican or happens to be a Democrat, the people generally respect the United States district courts, and have confidence in their fairness. So, when this monstrosity was devised, to make sure that it should not fail in its nefarious purpose, it was designed deliberately to keep the citizen of the United States out of that forum which we have been wont to consider the refuge of those seeking justice. No justice is wanted, so far as this bill is concerned. Trial by jury is denied. There is no way on earth for any man to get into court. He is tried by a body which observes no rules of evidence. And, if, forsooth, after being harassed and badgered and intimidated by the agents of the Commission, he is found guilty by this perambulatory kangaroo court, which served as his prosecutor and sat upon his case as a juror, then he cannot find any surcease from his difficulties or any respite from his injustices in the United States district court before a jury of his peers.

Mr. President, everyone wants to protect the rights of the minority in this country, but we should be able to do it without striking down and invading all the rights which are inherent in every American citizen, whether he be of the majority or the minority, to resort to the courts, and to have a trial by a jury of his peers in the vicinage where the crime is alleged to have been committed.

So another reason why there is provided an independent agency is to detour deliberately the citizen, who might be clamoring to get into court and to have a trial by jury, from his right to do so. The sponsors of the bill therefore proceed to issue an invitation to all Members of the Congress who have said they were

opposed to increasing the bureaucracy in Washington to vote to create a superbureau, instead of delegating any necessary duties in respect to this question to one of the old and established agencies of the Government.

Mr. President, we come to the title of the bill, to which I have already adverted. So many bills are introduced in Congress that about all that ever gets before the people is the title, and it is a great trick to write a title which will appeal to one who has not studied the bill, or appeal to the people, and the title to the bill before us is a work of art in this respect. This is described as a bill "to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry."

I think almost every person could agree on that—if the title was all there was to it. Of course, it dragoons all liberals into supporting the bill, whether it contains any element of fairness in itself or not, because, as I have said, everyone is in favor of fairness.

I wish to show, however, Mr. President, that in the campaign of misrepresentation which has been waged about the bill, I have seen articles which stated that the purpose of the proposed legislation was merely to carry on the present Fair Employment Practice Commission, which was created by Executive order. There never was a more misleading and untruthful statement than that, yet I have seen it in the press reports of some of the great press associations. There is no comparison between the powers which are granted by the bill before us and the powers which are exercised by the present so-called Fair Employment Practice Commission. The present Commission deals only with agencies of the Federal Government, the Federal departments, and those who do business with the Federal Government, enter into contracts with the Federal Government.

Oh, they did, in their grasp for power—as there will be a grasping for further power if we ever enact such a foolish measure as the one now pending—reach out and try to assume powers they did not have. They told newspaper owners they were going to cite them to the President if the newspapers printed an advertisement stating that an employer wanted a white man or a colored man to work for him. They threatened some labor unions which did not conform exactly to what the FEPC crowd, created by Executive order, thought should be done. But they had no real power except to deny contracts to people who did not agree to subject themselves to their jurisdiction. There was no way by which a man could be put in jail for not carrying out what they said. But under the bill we are now considering, the Commission proposed to be set up could put in jail every man who employs more than six persons if he did not make his employment practices subject absolutely to the Commission. They could put a man in jail and fine him \$5,000 if he resisted or impeded or interfered with an examination of his books and records without any warrant or authority of law on the part of the FEPC examiner. The bill is the greatest delegation of power the Congress has ever been asked to make.

I have studied the bill, I have read it a number of times, and I have prepared an amendment which I intend to offer to the caption of the bill if the time should ever come in the future when it would be proper to consider amendments to the bill. I should be willing to leave it to any fair-minded group of men, not swayed or biased, to determine which one of these captions better described the bill, whether it is a bill "to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry," as the proponents say in their catch-phrase title, or whether it should be—and I shall read my proposed title—a bill "to regulate and control the tastes, customs, habits, and manners of life of the American people; to establish an independent agency to dominate the executive branch of the Government, and to influence all policies of the Government, whether foreign or domestic; to invite alien immigrants and assure them of employment to the detriment of the right of native-born Americans to work; to nationalize all employment in industry, business, agriculture, and commerce; and to promote a Communistic form of government for the United States."

Mr. President, I am willing to leave it to the discriminating—of course, a man should not utter the word "discriminating," I suppose, any longer. When I was a boy one of my old-fashioned aunts, who had helped raise a large family on a Georgia farm, used to say that it was a very fine thing to be discriminating in one's tastes; but some Senators are undertaking to repeal that by operation of law. When I said I was willing to leave it to the discriminating, I meant one who was willing to study and analyze the bill. I would be willing to leave it to the discriminating to say whether or not the title I have devised would not eventually be more descriptive of what would happen in this country if the bill were to be enacted, than the misleading label that is now attached to it.

Mr. President, let us now consider the bill. It has become a custom not only to write an attractive title in order to generate public support and to catch the unwary in Congress, but to precede a bill by a high-sounding finding or declaration of policy. This bill, to be in tune with the modern day, undertakes to set forth a finding, a declaration of policy. I shall read it. This is what we are finding as a fact when we vote for the bill, what we are finding to be a fact:

The Congress finds that the practice of denying employment opportunities to, and discriminating in employment against, properly qualified persons by reason of their race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, fomented domestic strife and unrest.

O, Mr. President, we are living in a time when there is more unfortunate domestic strife and unrest than we have ever before known. Yet the Congress of the United States is chained to this bill by the demand that it find that that domestic unrest is fomented because of discrimination in employment. Every sane man in the Nation knows that today with practically 2,000,000 persons out on strike, with the picket lines spreading

around industrial plants, there is not a single bit of domestic unrest and strife which can be attributed to such a cause. Yet the supporters of this bill say, "We are not even going to let you introduce a bill which deals with the real causes of domestic strife and unrest." If a committee of this body wants to report such a bill to the floor there is objection made, the bill cannot be considered, "because we have declared in our findings and declaration of policy that all the strikes and all the troubles everywhere, all the ills that beset the body politic, will be cured if we simply pass this bill to prevent discrimination in employment."

Mr. President, there has never been more arrant poppycock. The Senate of the United States has never found itself in a more ridiculous or a more unenviable position than it does by undertaking to write into law such findings or declaration of policy as that, at a time when the whole structure of our country seems to be tumbling down from other causes. Yet we are rendered powerless to approach and deal with them. We cannot even introduce a bill with respect to them. We cannot even have reported to the Senate committee findings with respect to the causes.

I say, Mr. President, that the fiction in this declaration of policy is symbolic of all the provisions of this bill and of its title. They are all just as fictitious, they are all just as false, they are all just as ill-founded as the contention that this bill is aimed at the domestic strife and unrest that is all but destroying the economy of the Nation in this critical reconversion period.

Mr. President, the sponsors of this proposed legislation find—and they would have Senators vote for it to the exclusion of every other matter, even to the point of preventing discussion by those of us who wish to point out its fallacies—"that the practice of denying employment opportunities * * * deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production."

That is an amazing finding to make at this period. To the exclusion of any other legislation that the Congress might enact, they find, Mr. President, that it "endangers the national security." Although 18 of 20 legislatures which have considered a similar bill have defeated such a bill, including the States of the principal sponsors, the Senators from Minnesota and New Mexico, the sponsors of the bill find that the national security is endangered unless we make this bill paramount to any other legislation that the Congress can possibly consider and stall all the wheels and machinery of government to enforce such a declaration of policy.

They find that discrimination "endangers the general welfare, and adversely affects commerce." Of course, Mr. President, as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] pointed out yesterday—he did not say it in these words, but this was the intent of it—it was a distortion of the commerce clause of the Constitution to attempt to get some little scintilla of constitutionality into this measure, and until we came to this day of boards that can deny people the right

of a jury trial, boards that can haul a man anywhere in the land to try him, no person would have ever insisted that the commerce clause could be attached to such a far-fetched thing as that.

Mr. President, are these findings and declaration of policy true? Are all the evils which beset the Nation today due to discrimination in employment on account of race, creed, or national ancestry? I am perfectly willing to leave that to the conscience of any Member of the Senate whose conscience has not been deadened or immunized by surrender in the past.

Mr. President, of course that statement is not true. We talk about the general welfare and increase in production. What made us the greatest industrial Nation the world has ever seen? Was it the fact that there existed authority for a board to intrude itself and operate a man's business?

Mr. President, the great enterprises of this Nation today were not always great enterprises. We look today at United States Steel, employing hundreds of thousands of individuals, but United States Steel does not represent all of American business, and all of American enterprise. Real American enterprise and business is found in the hundreds of small plants and small places of business. The statement is made that we cannot exist without United States Steel, and perhaps that is true. But certainly United States Steel cannot exist unless these thousands of little outlets are available to them.

What is it, Mr. President, that stimulates production in this country? We are asked here now to vote for a declaration of policy which says that there cannot be full production unless this bill to regiment industry is passed. That is what we have to vote for under this declaration of policy. That is solemnly asserted, and every Senator who votes for the bill will assert on his responsibility that he thinks the thing which is threatening increased production in this country is the failure to have an FEPC such as is provided in the pending bill.

Mr. President, what built up this country? There were two things that built it up and gave us this great industrial empire. One of them was the profit motive, the desire of a man to earn money, the desire of a man to go into business, to succeed, and to improve his condition and lot in life. He went into business under the old idea that if he was able to build his business from a small enterprise to a large one he would have the property right in his property to select those who were to manage his business. This bill strikes that down, as I shall show before I conclude. Under this bill he would not have an unfettered right of selecting the man in whose loyalty he could repose trust. Previously he went into business with the idea that if he was a better judge of a man's capacity than was his competitor, he could get ahead of his competitor by selecting abler men to do his work and to conduct his business for him. This bill strikes down that part of the profit motive. Under it an employer cannot employ a man whom he thinks is the best man if, forsooth, there is another man whom the

FEPC thinks is as good, who happens to belong to one of the minority groups which are pressuring this bill. Of course, that cannot help but result in nationalizing all jobs in every line of business, on the farm, in the beauty shop, in the steam-boiler plant, in the shipyard, in the corner grocery store. It nationalizes all employment in every business that hires more than six individuals. A man cannot have a profit if he cannot conduct his business and say who is to do his work and who is to operate his business for him.

There is another thing, Mr. President, that has helped to develop the great industrial establishments of this Nation. Down through the years it has caused our people to enjoy a higher standard of living and greater opportunity for all, majority, and minority, individuals of different races and creeds, than any other people under the heavens enjoy. Mr. President, we can talk about opportunities and discriminations where minorities are concerned, but it is an amazing thing that all those minorities want to get into this country and be discriminated against. I should like to see anyone talk one of them into indignation over his discrimination to the extent that he would be willing to leave this country now. That is simply a fiction; it is simply a figment of the imagination; it is simply a vote trap.

Mr. President, as I have said, there is another thing that has made this a great country industrially and from a business standpoint, and that is the desire of a man to found a business for his son, to be able to give employment to his relatives, to be able to give employment to his neighbors, to be able to give employment to, forsooth—I merely mention it in a whisper—to be able to give employment even to the members of his church. Yet, if this bill should pass, the man with the aim in mind of establishing a business for his son, a business where his relatives and his neighbors could find employment, who would start a small plant, a small store, or other small business enterprise would do so in the mistaken belief that he had a right as an American citizen to show favoritism to those in his family or those in his neighborhood or those with whom he was intimately associated in the everyday aspects of life. Many of the industrial giants of this Nation grew from just such humble beginnings. A man would start a business to take care of his own and those around him. Through their ability and capacity, and the fact that they were congenial and could work together and understand one another in the management and enterprise of the business, the business would succeed, grow, and prosper.

Those who are most earnestly advocating the bill would say, "Of course, that is a mistake. A man ought not to be able to own an enterprise. It ought all to be owned and controlled by the Government of the United States."

As I stated a few moments ago, I do not say that everyone supporting the bill is a Communist or Socialist, but I do assert that every Communist and every Socialist is supporting the bill with every power at his command. It is said that it is a mistake for a man to start a busi-

ness for his son or to employ his relatives. If we pass this bill he will not have that incentive. We will cripple the profit motive, because the Government will tell him who is to operate his enterprise. Certainly he will start no business for the employment of the members of his community, the members of his church, or even the members of his family, if a board created by the Federal Government can come into his business and say to him, "You cannot promote this boy because he is your nephew. You do not have that right under the law." If a man has in his employ an alien, or a member of one of the described minority groups who thinks he should have the promotion, such a person can file a complaint and hale him before the board. The employer has his hands tied. He will be told, "You cannot promote that man because he is your nephew, and you are discriminating against an alien, or a member of some minority group."

How long will we be able to keep America the great industrial empire that it is? If we pass such a fool bill as this, which puts an employer in such a hole, how long will we be able to keep alive the ambition of our people to start enterprises of their own which they can handle as they see fit, for the benefit of their own families, their own neighbors, or the members of their own church?

There can be no doubt that the bill is designed to say to the employer, "If you do not hire or keep this member of a minority group you will be haled before the Commission, where you will have no chance on earth." What is he going to do? Suppose a man is operating a small plant with 40 employees, and 10 of the 40 are members of a minority group. If he should decide to lay off 10 employees, or was compelled to do so because of the vicissitudes of business, what would he do? Does anyone believe that he would lay off a single member of a minority group? Oh, no. Why? He would immediately have both hands tied behind him and a seal put over his mouth. He would be hauled as far as any of the little inspectors of the Commission might desire, to be tried in a kangaroo court, where there were no rules of evidence. He would be put to great expense. He might be bankrupted defending the case; and if he lost it, as he probably would before so prejudiced a body, with the court serving as prosecutor and having an interest in winning the case, he would have to pay out perhaps a year's or 2 year's back pay and restore the employee to his job. If the employer escaped being put in jail, he would certainly be harassed, embarrassed, and annoyed by an investigation, to say the least, if he did not retain all those who proposed to have protection under such a law.

Mr. President, section 2 of the bill is a declaration of this policy which undertakes in a backhanded manner which I have never understood to create an immunity relating to the right to work. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] discussed that question yesterday. However, I wish to read the section, because I shall refer to it in showing its narrowness, and how the bill, which is claimed to be an antidiscrimi-

nation bill, is in reality most discriminatory in all its terms. I read section 2:

SEC. 2. The right to work and to seek work without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry is declared to be an immunity, of all citizens of the United States, which shall not be abridged by any State or by an instrumentality or creature of the United States or of any State.

I am sure that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], judging by the question which he asked me a few minutes ago, caught the fact that in the entire bill the only place where the rights of a citizen are mentioned are in this statement. The bill, of course, is primarily intended to take care of the alien. But when it comes to the right to freedom from discrimination, when it undertakes to establish an immunity, it refers to citizens of the United States. I have studied the bill with some intensity and effort to try to find out just why that was true. I have been unable to reach any definite conclusion, except that this clause undertakes to apply to the States. It provides that the States shall not discriminate, and no subdivisions of the States shall discriminate. Some of the States, notably California, have laws which prevent aliens from working for the State. When I saw that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] was one of the authors of the bill, I assumed that he brought the citizen in at this place in order to protect the State law in California. This provision also would probably protect the State laws in several other States, which are similar to certain Federal laws which the bill proposes to repeal. There are Federal laws to the effect that aliens may not be employed on certain work. The bill, by its express terms, would repeal such laws; but I assume that it was decided at least to protect the State laws against employment of aliens by the States. However it may give a right to one to sue the States if he is a citizen.

In this day of world citizenship some of the States are still so narrow as to try to give a little consideration in employment to their own citizens ahead of the outsider. I do not disagree with that theory, because I am not an advocate of world citizenship. I believe that I have about as much compassion for suffering humanity all over the world as has anyone else. I never shall forget how I felt when I went into Germany last summer. I did not believe that there could be any conceivable circumstances under which I would feel the slightest pity for any German or person of German blood who was a part of wartime Germany. I thought that my heart and mind were steeled against it. But, Mr. President, when I went through the wreckage which had been the cities of Germany and saw the old, the lame, the halt, and the little children—because they were all that were left—I could feel only compassion for them. I feel sorry for them to this hour. If it were within my power to help them as human beings, I would do so, despite the feeling which I have against the forces in Germany which set out to destroy civilization.

So, Mr. President, I have compassion for the peoples of the world; but I cannot go along as fast as do some of my

colleagues. I have not yet adopted the philosophy which is being taught everywhere, that a man is proud of his country when he has nothing else to be proud of. That is becoming a common statement in this day of new thought: "A man is proud of his country when he has nothing else to be proud of." I must be in that position, Mr. President, because I am proud of my country. I am for my people first. I am not primarily a citizen of the world. I do not like to go as far as this bill goes, and I shall not go that far by my vote. I will not say, "Bring in all the suffering, teeming millions of the earth, wherever they be. We have established an agency to see that they get jobs in this country, even if it is to the detriment of the plain, everyday, garden-variety American citizen who cannot associate himself with a minority." I cannot go that far; so I must plead guilty to the charge of narrowness being hurled at those of us who are opposing this bill because we believe that the native-born American citizen is still entitled to some little consideration ahead of the alien immigrant.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to one other matter. We are told that discrimination in employment will destroy the country, and we are asked to vote for the bill so the country may not be destroyed. We are told, furthermore, that the national security will be endangered unless we pass this bill and make these findings, and according to the sponsors of the bill, prevent discrimination in employment.

Of course, Mr. President, to say that this bill deals with all discrimination in employment is merely another fraud on its face; there cannot be any question about that. Where is the discrimination in employment in this country? For every one person in the classes which the bill seeks to protect, there are at least 4 persons who are being discriminated against in employment because of the fact that they are not members of a certain labor union and do not choose to join a certain labor union. Oh, the bill is silent as to that. But an ordinary, everyday, garden variety of gentle American who does not wish to join a labor union is afforded not the slightest protection whatever by the terms of this bill. He can be discriminated against as long and as much as anyone may desire; indeed he cannot secure any employment without being a member of a labor union. But this bill does not do one thing in his behalf.

Mr. President, sometimes, when I consider this bill, a major abortion, as I believe it will be, if enacted, when I consider that it has been brought forward at a time when it can have no other effect than to tie up the machinery of the Congress of the United States at this critical hour in our national life, and when it is claimed that there is discrimination in employment, when there is not the courage in some quarters to face the facts and recognize the place where the real discrimination exists, I wonder if this is still America. That is the truth about the situation. No votes are obtained by talking about not discriminating against a man because he is not a member of a labor

union. A few of the minority votes may be garnered, but they cost all the majority votes. But under this bill all the minority votes would be obtained, and the majority are not supposed to know what is happening to them in the case of a bill such as this.

At any rate, Mr. President, the bill fails to deal with the case of labor unions and closed shops, where discrimination in employment exists. I say it is almost a fraud on its face to give us a bill which seeks to regulate discrimination in employment and to call it a fair employment practice bill, when it does not even deal with a question as far-reaching and as sweeping as the discrimination which has been practiced against hundreds of thousands of American citizens because they have not been members of a certain labor union. If this bill ever reaches the amendment stage—although I do not think it will—certainly there will be offered an amendment, and there will be a record vote on it, as to whether Senators wish to deal with only the minor part of the discrimination in employment.

Mr. President, there is another place where there is discrimination, and grave discrimination, in employment; but this bill does not face that question at all or deal with it, because the discrimination is confined to only the ordinary, everyday, garden variety of American citizens who are not fortunate enough to be able to associate themselves with some minority groups. I refer, Mr. President, to the discrimination in employment which everyone recognizes is had on account of sex—discrimination against women in employment. Just an ordinary, everyday, garden variety of American woman can be discharged at will, and she will be if this bill is passed, and she will have no rights on earth. She cannot go to any commission. She has no recourse anywhere. She can see her job taken by a member of one of these minority groups, even if she has five minor children who are dependent upon her. She has utterly no rights. What will happen under this bill when we get down to the necessity of laying off a few people and when we are confronted with the cases of some employed women who have no rights under these kangaroo courts and when the employers are faced with the applications of some persons who would be able to cost the employers a great deal of money under the powers proposed to be granted by the bill? What would an employer do? He would do just what you would do if you were in his place, Mr. President. He would lay off the persons who have no minority rights. That is what would happen under this bill. So, Mr. President, when we are asked to deal with this situation in which it is said there is such great discrimination in employment, we find this second category of persons which the authors of the bill have not been able to see, because they cannot see the forest for the trees.

Mr. President, do not think that the women will not be able to find out about it. As evidence of that, I hold in my hand a letter coming from the National Advisory Council of the National Woman's Party. I wish to state that, so far

as I know, the letter was not written by a southern Democrat. I do not know the lady who wrote the letter, but she is chairman of the National Advisory Council of the National Woman's Party, with headquarters here in Washington. I do not know a great deal about the organization. I know some of the members of its council by reputation. One of them is Emily Dunning Barringer, M. D., who is past president of the American Medical Women's Association. Another member of the council is Katherine Devereux Blake. Other members are: Elizabeth Pickett Chevalier, author; Mary Merritt Crawford, M. D.; Lavinia L. Dock, nurse emeritus, Henry Street Settlement; Anna W. Goodrich, dean emeritus, Yale School of Nursing; Katherine Houghton Hepburn, social reformer—who has also attained no little distinction in the field of the theater and on the stage; Malvina Hoffman, sculptor; Fannie Hurst, author; Inez Haynes Irwin, author; and also on the council are a number of other well-known women, including Gladys Swarthout, of the Metropolitan Opera Co., and Margaret Sanger. A number of distinguished women are members of this council. I do not care to take time to read all the names. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is off the floor at this time, and so I shall ask unanimous consent to have the entire list of names of the members of the National Advisory Council of the National Woman's Party printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list of members of the National Advisory Council of the National Woman's Party was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBERS

Emily Dunning Barringer, M. D., past president of American Medical Women's Association.
Katherine Devereux Blake.
Elizabeth Pickett Chevalier, author.
Mary Merritt Crawford, M. D.,
Lavinia L. Dock, nurse emeritus, Henry Street Settlement.
Anna W. Goodrich, dean emeritus, Yale School of Nursing.
Katherine Houghton Hepburn, social reformer.
Malvina Hoffman, sculptor.
Fannie Hurst, author.
Inez Haynes Irwin, author.
Lee Allison Johnston, M. D., president of American Medical Women's Association.
Elizabeth Thatcher Kent.
Ethel Traphagan Leigh, head of Traphagan School of Fashion.
Catharine Macfarlane, M. D., vice president, Medical Women's International Association.
Georgia O'Keefe, artist.
Mary Philbrook, lawyer.
Lena Madesin Phillips, LL. D., president of International Federation of Business and Professional Women.
Mary Pickford, actress and producer.
Helena T. Ratterman, M. D., past president of American Medical Women's Association.
Mrs. Ogden Reid, vice president of the New York Herald Tribune.
Elizabeth Selden Rogers.
Marion Margery Scranton, Pennsylvania member, Republican National Committee.
Margaret Sanger, social reformer.
Gladys Swarthout, of Metropolitan Opera Co.
Mary Church Terrell, president emeritus, National Association of Colored Women.

Joseph Newcomb Whitney, past president of Connecticut Housewives League.

Dr. Mary E. Wooley, president emeritus, Mount Holyoke College.

Nora Stanton Barney, architect and civil engineer, chairman.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the women whose names I have read are some of the members of the group of women whose chairman has sent me the letter to which I am referring. I shall read what is contained in the letter, a form letter which I assume was sent to all Senators. Perhaps it was sent only to me; but if it was, I am highly flattered, because certainly it struck a responsive chord. Here is what they say about this bill, the authors of which say is so important in order to abolish discrimination in employment.

MY DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: We wish to call your attention to the so-called Wagner-Scanlon antidiscrimination bill—

Mr. President, I shall have to interpolate at this point that the authorship of the bill has changed from time to time. Members of the two bodies of Congress have vied with each other in their desire to have their names added as authors of the bill, and therefore the authorship of the bill has been changed, and so we shall have to correct that part of the letter by saying that they are writing in respect to the Chavez-Downey-Wagner-Murray-Capper-Langer-Aiken bill.

Mr. President, as I was saying, the writer of the letter states that they wish to call our attention to the—

antidiscrimination bill which outlaws discrimination—

Mr. President, I hope Senators will hear this. If they do not hear it now, they will hear about it soon after they vote for any such bill as this measure which undertakes to outlaw discrimination against some persons, without undertaking to outlaw discrimination against the white women of America.

As I have said, the bill calls our attention to the so-called—

antidiscrimination bill which outlaws discrimination on account of race, color, creed, or religion, but invites, by implication, discrimination on account of sex, as it will continue to be legal to so discriminate. We believe in equal opportunity for all, but not in presenting the colored race and the Jewish race and every other race a right that is denied to white women.

Mr. President, if I were making that statement on my own, I know some Senators would say, "There is a southern Democrat bringing up the racial question." However, I am now reading what the distinguished women of the medical world, literary world, stage, and screen state when they analyze this bill which is presented to us as a great panacea in respect to discrimination in employment. I continue to read from their letter:

If this bill becomes law, white women will be the only citizens in the country to whom redress in the courts is denied on grounds of discrimination.

I do not dignify them by calling these star-chamber tribunals a court.

The letter continues, as follows:

Under the New York antidiscrimination bill, backed by the CIO and colored and Jewish organizations, the court can fine an employer \$500 or commit him to jail for 1 year

if he dares, for instance, to lay off a young colored or Jewish bachelor and retain a white woman with five children, or to lay off a colored or Jewish woman and retain a white woman.

There is no question about that; that is exactly what would happen under the bill. A white woman with five children would be laid off because she would have no rights before such a kangaroo court. An employer would not involve himself in a great deal of trouble with a Jewish or Negro bachelor, even though he had no family responsibilities, by firing him and then being confronted with a charge of discrimination.

Mr. President, these ladies give us this advice:

The so-called antidiscrimination bill should be either amended to include the word "sex"—

If we ever get to amendments I will offer such an amendment—

or its passage should be postponed.

I shall also endeavor to postpone the passage of this bill. So, Mr. President, this is one time when ladies have written to Senators that they are in accord with their views. I do not know the signer of the letter, who appears to be a very distinguished woman. Her name is Nora Stanton Barney, who is evidently a very noted architect and civil engineer.

Mr. President, the country is bogged down in industrial strife, and confusion is running rampant. Apparently the best bill which could be brought into the Senate is the so-called antidiscrimination bill now before us, which covers but a small fraction of the real genuine discriminations which exist in connection with employment, discriminations which bring about heartaches and sufferings to many persons. Not only, Mr. President, does the bill not bring them relief, but in the very nature of things, when considering the question of lay-offs, it discriminates against women who do not belong to minority groups. Yes, Mr. President; of course, we will always have some lay-offs. It is all right to tie up the business of the Senate in order to defeat consideration of legislation dealing with strikes. The business of the Senate can be tied up, and by objecting to the consideration of reports and the introduction of bills, assurance may be had that no legislation will be considered. But we all know that such tactics will result in continually defeating legislation which should be considered in connection with the present industrial situation now existing throughout the country.

Mr. President, I have stated the position which we find ourselves in every time any of these pressure groups get a whiphand and go running around, working both sides of the street, and getting Senators to bid against each other for votes. Many newspapers and radio commentators in the United States have charged over the radio and through the columns of the press that something is blocking this bill which is designed to bring about fairness in employment. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I shall not relent in my efforts to continue to point out that this monstrosity in the form of the bill which is now before the Senate is most unfair to those

who are least able to defend themselves against it.

The discriminations which have been pointed out are not the only discriminations which are practiced. There are other discriminations which are much more widespread than anything which this bill undertakes to correct. Up until the time of the manpower shortage there was very great discrimination exercised in employment against those who were more than 40 years of age. Everyone knows it. It is common knowledge.

Last week I read an article in a newspaper. I wish I had saved it, but I recall it distinctly. The article stated that the discrimination to which I refer was creeping into employment during the reconversion period. The article stated that those who were past 35 years of age were being discriminated against. I had understood that the discrimination was practiced chiefly against those who were 40 years of age. There is not a word in this bill concerning such discrimination. A man may be past 40 years of age. He may be a man who is just an ordinary, everyday garden variety of gentle American. He may go to some industry, store, or plant, which employs more than six persons, and say that he wants a job. He may say, "I see you have a vacancy." The employer can tell him, "I will not hire you because you are past 40 years of age. I will not take anyone into this business who is more than 40 years of age." The man who is looking for employment may reply, "Well, I can do the work." The employer may say, "Oh, I know you can do the work. There is no question about that. You are well qualified in every respect, but I will not hire you because I do not want to go to the trouble of training a man of your age for the work here which you would have to perform. I employ only men who are under 30 years of age." Mr. President, that man who is seeking employment has no rights whatever under this bill unless he happens to be a member of one of these minority groups. The situation is an example of so-called nondiscrimination.

Let us take another example. An American citizen, ordinary Bill Jones, who is past 40 years of age, walks into a place of employment with either a Negro or a Jew, both of whom are 40 years of age. If the ordinary American is told that he will not be hired because he is 40 years of age, he has no recourse on earth. However, if the other person is told the same he may say, "Well, you know I can do the work, don't you?" The employer says, "Yes; just as this other man can do the work." The reply may be, "Well, I will take you before the Fair Employment Practice Commission because you are discriminating against me on account of my creed or my color."

Mr. President, the first of those men could be a soldier who had returned from the front after having fought in the muck or mire of Normandy or Okinawa. If he were past 40 years of age and were refused employment on that account, he would have no recourse. He could go into a plant with a Communist who is 40 years of age. The Communist could get before this Commission and demand that he be hired because of being a

member of the minority group. That man might believe in overthrowing this Government by force and violence, or he might be an alien, but nevertheless he would have rights under this bill which would be denied the ordinary everyday average American citizen who could not get into the courts, and who would have nothing against him except his age.

So, Mr. President this is a bill which attempts to deal with discrimination in employment without affording to all people the same right which the bill affords to aliens, Communists, and members of minority groups to go to this kangaroo court. When the time comes I shall offer an amendment that a man may not be discriminated against in employment because of his age.

Mr. President, what I have stated shows what happens when we deal with a subject such as this. As I have said, we are all minorities in this country. When, by virtue of a statute, we try to give one minority preference over another, we run into trouble every time in a democracy such as ours.

Mr. President, here is section 3 of the bill. Here is where we get to the heart of the bill:

Sec. 3. (a) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer within the scope of this act—

(1) to refuse to hire any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(2) to discharge any person from employment because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Of course, Mr. President, that language speaks for itself. First, it says that it applies to a person, and therefore it is made to apply to aliens. The word "person," by any number of judicial decisions, applies to all human beings. This bill would repeal any law which may be in effect at the present time limiting employment of aliens by the Government. As I stated a few moments ago, I do not think I have any greater prejudice against the alien than has the average American. I do not view him in the light of the present-day liberals who say that the alien is entitled to every right and benefit of an American citizen and, as this bill provides, is entitled to rights and benefits which are denied to American citizens. I do not go that far, but I do not think we are going to solve the alien question, or all the questions in the world, by bringing the aliens into this country. I must plead guilty to having one of those old-fashioned minds which many people would call narrow, very much opposed to any increase of immigration to this country.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In connection with the paragraph just read by the Senator I should like to have him give his interpretation, if he will, of this question as the bill is written. Suppose a man of an announced communistic belief, communistic faith, applied for a job. Suppose that a year or so passes and a Nazi, of avowed Nazi philosophy, applies for a job. What is the Senator's interpretation as to whether or not the provisions of the bill could be enforced upon failure

of an employer to employ such persons based upon those reasons?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that I appreciate the question, and I think this is a perfectly fair statement, under the terms of the bill. If Adolf Hitler could in some way secure immunity for his war crimes and be brought into this country tomorrow, the fact that he was a Nazi could not be held against him, under the bill. He would have a right to hale an employer before the board, if the employer held against him the fact that he was a Nazi, and he would get a job as a paperhanger, and keep some returning American soldier who wanted to be a paperhanger from getting the job, and the returning American soldier would not have the slightest right on earth to go before this perambulatory kangaroo court and seek relief that would be afforded Adolf Hitler if he got into this country.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then is it the Senator's interpretation that if a factory employment agency had employment opportunities, and 50 or a hundred avowed and known Communists applied for employment in the factory, the factory employment agency would be bound, under the bill as it is now written, to hire them, or suffer the penalties provided under the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the fact that they were Communists, or members of a Nazi band, or were Hitler or members of his immediate staff coming into this country from Germany, were the only reason they had for not employing them, they would have rights under the bill, they could go to this board, if they were excluded from employment solely for that reason, a right which the ordinary, everyday, garden variety of American does not possess.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BALL. I am wondering under what kind of a definition the Senator would cover political affiliations under the words "race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry."

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Minnesota is a scholar. The word "creed" comes from the Latin word "credo," which means "I believe." It is not confined to any religious faith; it applies to any minority political party, or to a Democrat or to a Republican. I am surprised the Senator does not know that the word was put in here to protect Communists and to secure them employment. There cannot be any question about it. The word "creed" does not refer to religion. It is commonly applied to religion, because the ritual of church started out "credo," meaning "I believe," and some use it as referring to religion. But the word "creed" refers to any belief a man might have. There is no question about it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, has the Senator any information about who drew this bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to know who did actually draft the bill in all its details, because it is the most skillfully

drawn bill, to accomplish more and look as if it does less, than has ever been before the American Congress.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I, in part, take a little credit for writing the bill, and certainly the Senator would not accuse me, a Roman Catholic, possibly not very well liked in certain quarters, of being for Hitler or being for anything communistic. I might tolerate the Communists, but I do not like communism.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I certainly do not wish to say anything that would offend the Senator from New Mexico, but I know as a practical matter that the Senator did not draft this bill, because this bill, in substantially the same form, had been in this body under different sponsorship before the Senator from New Mexico put his name to the bill and introduced it here. It has been here in substantially the same form. Let us be frank about this.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let us be frank about it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to be.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was sponsored by Republicans and Democrats, by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], who cannot be accused of being a Communist; it was sponsored partly by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], a Democrat, who, I believe, is not a Communist.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was not talking about the Senate sponsor of the bill; I was talking about the effect of the bill, and its authorship.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When we say "creed" we mean religion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then the word should be so defined.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When we say "persons" we mean Americans.

Mr. RUSSELL. O, Mr. President, there are a hundred decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which say that "person" means an alien, and aliens are entitled to every benefit under the bill. I am amazed that the Senator from New Mexico, an able lawyer, does not know that. I could read decisions here for hours to that effect.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator may be against that, and if that is the only thing he has against the bill, let us qualify it. We are trying to pass an American bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is trying to pass this bill, and I am pointing out wherein it is not an American bill. I am referring to all the bunkum that has been practiced over this bill, in bringing in such a monumental monstrosity, subversive of all American life, when it is not an American bill, but it is designed to help all those who are un-American. I am not complaining at the Senator, or criticizing him, but the Senator knows the bill has been written and introduced under different names before he got hold of it. It has been in the House and in the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course it has.

Mr. RUSSELL. I quit the Senator of any desire to overthrow the Government, or to encourage Communists;

nevertheless, the bill has that effect—this bill we are being pilloried for resisting.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I presume there have been fair employment practice bills here before.

Mr. RUSSELL. Practically like this. There is no difference between them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Like any class of legislation which comes before this body, tax legislation, military legislation. Every bill is different. The wording might be different.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is identical, but it is different. That is what the Senator says. Very well. There never has been any such bill here, because it applies to aliens, and I assert that whoever wrote this bill deliberately intended to use the word "citizen" when it did not make any difference, but when it got down to the man people had to employ, they used the word "persons." It is abundantly established under decisions of our courts, that the word "person" applies to aliens within our jurisdiction. I think it would apply whether a man was here legally or not. I am sure it would. He would be a person. The word "person" means every human being, and that is what I am objecting to.

Oh, yes, pillory people for wanting to oppose the bill, for insisting that it stay before the Senate until the country understands it. Get on the radio all the left-wing commentators talking about "those infernal southern Democrats" tying up the Senate, when we are not at all responsible. When a bill like this is brought in, which proposes to create a monumental employment agency and invite all the aliens to our shores to take over jobs which I, for one, think should be held by Americans, that at least they should have priority, I will fight it. Men may talk about that fight on the radio and inveigh against it in the press, but I will not be deterred in the slightest in my opposition.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How does the Senator think it would be possible for the Board or Commission to determine the motive behind the employment of a particular person or the discharge of a person? Is that susceptible of proof?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course it is not. The bill is not intended to settle anything by proof. When there are no rules of evidence, when they can convict a man on hearsay evidence, when they can deny him a jury trial, when they can remove him from his vicinage, in violation of a right he had under our old Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, it is not intended to give him a chance in court. It is not intended to be susceptible of proof. The bill was not written with that purpose in mind. It was the purpose to intimidate everybody in this country into giving priorities in employment, in layoffs, and in promotions, to the minority groups, including Communists and aliens.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that at a hearing the accused

would even have to be confronted with the witnesses against him?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think so. They would have no rules of procedure at all.

A few minutes ago the Senator from New Mexico said something about the fact that he was a Roman Catholic. I wish to say that I know of no reason why the Senator should have brought that into this discussion. Certainly, I have said nothing on earth that would have justified the Senator from New Mexico bringing that statement in. I do not know what his purpose was. I am getting to the point in considering this bill, when I think about purpose when I hear things, and I should like to know what the Senator's purpose was.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My reason for the statement was that the Senator was making the point that Communists were interested in the proposed legislation, and there is nothing further from communism than the Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Roman Catholic Church will maintain that position. The Roman Catholic Church has been a great agency for discipline in this country. I certainly must be absolved of any attempt to bring anybody's kind of church into this discussion. I have not mentioned church.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator certainly is absolved.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to say, furthermore, that I have no religious prejudice whatever. I have been charged with it. I remember when I was a candidate for the Senate of the United States the first time. I was the Governor of my State, and I had reorganized the departments of the government, I thought very effectively and efficiently. It must have been a pretty good job, because what was set up has lasted down to the present, in the main. We consolidated about 115 bureaus and agencies into some 14. We did away with all the commissions which were operating the various educational institutions, and created one board of regents.

When I was a candidate for the Senate I went to a county where my opposition thought that the Ku Klux Klan was pretty strong, and I had a friend there who was almost afraid to speak to me out in the open, who came to my car and presented me with a handbill which was distributed in that county. I shall never forget the headline of the handbill. It was a great big handbill. The headline was:

Governor RUSSELL sees to it that a certain percentage of your tax money goes to the Pope in Rome.

That great headline appeared on the handbill. I proceeded to read the handbill. It contained an insidious and violent attack on me because it happened that I had appointed as chairman of the board to control and handle all the university and school system of Georgia a very good friend of mine and a very able man who was a Roman Catholic. I also had appointed a Roman Catholic as an examiner of banks. We do not have as many Catholics in my State as there are in the State of the Senator from New Mexico, but there are some who are

among our outstanding and ablest citizens. I suppose that perhaps the charge was technically correct, for these men were very loyal Catholics. The father of Mr. Hughes Spaulding had been specially decorated by the Pope, and I am sure they all contributed generously to the church. They drew some salary from the State, and it may be that 1 penny of their State salary was commingled with some funds which eventually got to the Pope. But, Mr. President, my people are not swept off their feet by attempts to inject religious prejudice either on the floor of the Senate or in the State in a political campaign. I went before my people and I told them in that campaign "Yes; I appointed these two men. I have never yet seen any human being who had enough religion of any kind to hurt him, and I have no apologies to make." My people justified that position and elected me over very strong opposition.

My State voted for Alfred E. Smith in 1928 when other States which were supposed to be Democratic were falling by the wayside. So the Senator from New Mexico cannot bring any religious prejudice to reflect on my position in this matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, Mr. President; and it was not the purpose of the Senator from New Mexico to do that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know why the Senator mentioned what he did, then.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sorry to have the matter brought into the discussion in this way. The point I was trying to make was that those whom I said were in favor of the bill were not Communists. I do not know whether there are any Communists for the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know there are Communists for the bill. There are Communists in the Fair Employment Practice Committee who will be legislated into permanent positions by the adoption of this measure; at least the Department of Justice, after investigation, said they were Communists.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want to make my position clear to the Senator from Georgia. Far be it from me to accuse him of any intolerance. I have worked with him too long in committees and elsewhere in connection with liberal legislation, and so forth, and I would not want the impression to be created in the mind of the Senator that my purpose in speaking was to try to raise some kind of religious strife or condemn the Senator for something else. My purpose was to say that, as everyone knows, that if there is one church which is against communism, it is the church I spoke of, and to say that if there were Communists in favor of the legislation, they were not the only ones who are behind legislation of this type.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to support the Senator's church in its opposition to communism. I am trying to fight communism right here and now on the floor in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Assuming this bill should be seriously considered, does not the Senator think it ought to provide that all employers whom we assume

might be guilty of discrimination ought to be obliged to go to church every Sunday and to learn to be kind and to love their brothers, and gradually cease to have any ideas of discrimination? Is not that an essential if this legislation is ever to be of any benefit to the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course you can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink, and that is the reason I am resisting so bitterly this idea of legislating respecting tastes. There is no accounting for taste. What is the expression—"De gustibus non est disputandum"? I ask my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arkansas, who has been a college president, to check on the accuracy of my quotation. There is a little jingle that goes something like this:

I do not love thee, Dr. Fell,
The reason why I cannot tell;
But this alone I know full well,
I do not love thee, Dr. Fell.

There is no way to account for taste in individuals or in the matter of selection, and it cannot be dealt with by legislation. You cannot legislate anything into the hearts and minds of the people. You can gradually eliminate prejudice and ill feeling between groups. Oh, Mr. President, we have made the most phenomenal progress in that direction that any civilization has ever seen. We have come nearer to living together with diverse groups in this Nation in relative harmony than any people has been able to accomplish. We have gone further along the line of inspiring men to tolerance of other men's views and beliefs than any other people have ever done. We propose by this bill to do away with it all now. Oh, yes, to wreck and destroy all that has been done to eliminate intolerance and prejudice and ill feeling in the minds and hearts of the diverse groups of the United States. We are going to do that because we are going to put the pliers to them and wrench and twist them and make them do what we think is right.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. WILEY. I believe the Senator from Georgia agrees with me that the great and imperative need in America today is to get production. In order to get production we have to get men back to work. I ask the Senator this question: Assuming that the pending bill were to become law, is there anything in it that would get men back to work or that would result in production?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not one thing on earth. It would not make a job for one single American citizen. It would result that the minority groups who are sought to be benefited by the bill would have an advantage over the average American. But it would not make a job for one American citizen. It would result in striking down jobs. If this measure were enacted it would result finally in indignities being heaped upon many

employers, who would be hauled around before kangaroo courts and they will go out of business.

Mr. President, in studying this bill—and I say it is the most skillfully prepared bill I have ever undertaken to read and study—I notice in subsection 3 of section 3 that within the prohibited acts that are herein prescribed and punished appears the following:

(3) To discriminate against any person in compensation or in other terms or conditions of employment.

Mr. President, that language ought to be defined. That language should be defined clearly. If I understand the general purpose of the bill there is a strong probability that this Commission will go into the question of restrictive covenants on the theory that that is a condition of employment. Of course if the bill is passed and it is not applied to restrictive covenants we can depend upon it that in a short time it will result in eliminating all restrictive covenants in any conveyances anywhere, because certainly if we can in the bill which is now pending declare that discrimination will wreck the country we can declare that a restrictive covenant which limits a race of people who might live in a certain community would be absolutely invalid and should be set aside. I would not be at all sure but that the effort would be made to do it under the language I have just read, but certainly we would be confronted with that possibility.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator a question. Has he read the editorial which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, which is based on a statement made by Comptroller General Lindsay Warren?

The second question is: If the Senator has read it or has not read it, Mr. Warren suggests that the situation in America today is extremely critical. The editorial says:

Mr. Warren, though justifiably depressed over the outlook, is not without hope. But he believes that only a widespread awakening by the American people to the dangers of national bankruptcy that may lie ahead can affect a change for the better. The remedies are clear, he says, but there is little chance of applying them unless the taxpayers insist that their Government apply them. First of all, the Comptroller General pleads for a drastic reorganization of governmental agencies to eliminate waste and inefficiency. Incidentally, the President was given authority to streamline the Government under the Reorganization Act passed last month. Mr. Warren places second on the list of remedial measures a strenuous effort to balance the National Budget through a sharp reduction of Federal expenditures. This will require wholehearted support by the people of congressional economy moves. Third, Mr. Warren calls for a more conscientious type of public service by those entrusted with the responsibility of spending other people's money. Fourth, he urges a reexamination by Congress of its blank-check grants of spending money to certain executive agencies. And, finally, he advocates that the States assume a proper share of their responsibilities toward the Union instead of looking to the Federal Government for more and more assistance.

My question is, Does this bill in any way provide the relief suggested by any of the points the Comptroller General has suggested?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not even remotely touch them. It does not deal with any real problem which exists today. It is the most insignificant matter that has been mentioned by the President. And yet it is proposed to create a gigantic structure to deal with an imaginary situation which does not exist, and to establish an agency which will have power to do harm far beyond that which might exist under present conditions.

Mr. President, subsection 4 of section 3 undertakes to deal with employment agencies and placement services, or other places where it is said there might be discrimination because of race, color, creed, or national origin.

We come next to the labor-union section of the bill. Of course we know that the PAC, the Political Action Committee, and the CIO have been the principal champions of this legislation. They have supported it in and out of season, and with every means and method at their command. Some of the other labor organizations are opposed to this provision. The American Federation of Labor in its pronouncements on the subject has stated that it was bitterly opposed to having the proposed Fair Employment Practice Commission coming into its unions and telling them whom they might elect as officers and whom they might have as members of the unions. The American Federation of Labor stated that it was in favor of the fair employment practice bill, but opposed to the provision with respect to labor unions, and it has asked that it be stricken out.

At any rate, it is proposed to bring labor unions within the purview of the Fair Employment Practice Act. With respect to a labor union, the bill declares that it is held to be an unfair employment practice "to deny full membership rights and privileges to any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry."

Mr. President, I happened to notice a certain article in the New York Times of last Sunday. I was sitting in my room reading the newspaper before going to the office to read the bill, and I happened to run across an article which is headed "Red charges fly in Flint strikes. Union leader, a Trotskyite, is ousted—school closing chief on Government lists." The article is dated Flint, Mich., January 18, and reads as follows:

FLINT, MICH., January 18.—Factional divisions in the UAW-CIO General Motors locals here brought charges today that the international, regional, and local, union officials were afraid to join in a movement to purge the union of communistic infiltration into positions of leadership.

Of course the CIO leadership was afraid to join. CIO leaders were in Washington demanding that this bill be jammed through without benefit of explanation. If the bill were enacted into law it would put such leaders in jail if they undertook to regulate the membership of the union by dismissing a person

because he was a Communist or a Trotskyite who advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Continuing with the article:

Other union leaders asserted that the charges, which have resulted in the removal of one local union official, were part of "a Red scare," the purpose of which was to split the union.

The ousting of Robert A. Carter as chairman of the bargaining committee of AC Spark Plug division local because of his alleged membership in the Trotskyite party was upheld by Archie Myers, president of the local, which claims a membership of 7,300.

I understand that Mr. Myers was the man who was trying to have the Trotskyites and the Communists discharged from the union.

Mr. Myers also condemned the stand taken by three other local presidents and criticized regional and international officers for failing to join in the purge movement. The accused local presidents had charged anti-Trotskyite committeemen with an attempt to break up the union during its wage strike against General Motors. The committeemen are W. E. Rodgers, William Kontyko, John Jordan, and Charles Keene.

IN UNPOPULAR POSITION

"I must disagree with the presidents of Fisher Body, Buick, and Chevrolet locals," Mr. Myers said. "People in prominent positions both in the regional office and international unions know what is taking place in the union but because at this time it is an unpopular position to take they will stand back and continue to take only pot shots in the dark."

He urged rank and file members to attend their local meetings and prevent their union from being dominated by "party controlled individuals who are pledged to put the party first and union second."

The creed is the party or, rather, the party is the creed.

Mr. Myers said the ousted committeeman admitted to him in October that he was the second charter member of the Trotskyite party in Flint.

The bargaining committeemen who ousted Mr. Carter charged that communistic infiltration into positions of authority was endangering the union, that Trotskyites were inciting pickets to violence and that members would be put in key positions in the party, union, and government. The committeemen named Sol Dollinger, a Trotskyite party organizer who came here from New York, as chief troublemaker for the union.

LINKED TO SCHOOL STRIKE

Local AC committeemen charged that the Trotskyites had gained sufficient influence in the CIO Greater Flint union industrial council, claiming to represent 50,000 workers here, to cause passage of a resolution supporting the maintenance workers' strike that has closed all of Flint's public schools. They will attempt at a meeting tonight to dissolve the council. The school strike was in opposition to union policy, the committeemen said.

Casper P. Kenny, a member of the CIO council, a representative in the State legislature and field representative of the State, County and Municipal Workers (CIO) and leader of the school strike, was revealed as a Communist Party member and an ex-bootlegger in FBI, Army Intelligence, and State police records. He was under surveillance here by agents of these organizations during the war.

Here is a man who was a Communist by creed. He occupied an office in the union. He was a bootlegger in secret

documents during the war. He was under surveillance by the agents of various Government organizations.

Government records show Kenny was a member of the Communist Party's educational committee, the program of which included promotion of understanding of Communist theories in Flint and Pontiac schools. Communist data uncovered by the Government agents mentioned Kenny as "the best worker" here. He made this reply:

"Communism is not the issue in the strike of the school-maintenance workers. It is a question of obtaining 10 cents per hour increase and other demands."

Some of us who believe in the rights of labor organizations have been concerned about the apparently irresponsible and radical leadership which was developing in some of the CIO unions. Here is a case in which one of the unions is trying to purge itself of a Communist official, a man who has bootlegged the secret documents of Army intelligence and of his State police. Mr. President, if Senators vote for this bill they are voting to tell that labor union that if it purges itself of this man because he is a Communist, every one of its members can be put in jail. That is what it amounts to.

I read the following very significant language on page 3 of the bill, in section 3:

(c) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer or labor union within the scope of this act to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person because he has opposed any practices forbidden by this act or because he has filed a charge, testified, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

Mr. President, why was it necessary to put that special language in the bill if it was not intended to say to a Communist attempting to promote the Communist philosophy, "You can go as far as you like in resisting any effort to remove a Communist from a labor union, and in punishing those who wish to purge the union of communism. You will be protected, and any person who attempts to do anything about it will be haled before the kangaroo court, where he has no rights, and we will make him regret the day of his birth."

Section 4 of the bill merely relates to its scope. It provides that the act shall apply to "any employer." I wish Senators to notice how wide the term is. It applies to any employer. It does not say what kind of business he may be engaged in. The Senator from Wisconsin, who always is so diligent in staying on the floor and scrutinizing legislation, had already raised the question that there would be absolutely no limit, no standard. The bill would apply to any employer. It would not make any difference who he was or what kind of business he was in or what he was about. The bill provides that—

This act shall apply to any employer having in his employ six or more persons, who is (1) engaged in interstate or foreign commerce or in operations affecting such commerce.

Mr. President, I have already stated that the Supreme Court held that using some stuff on a farm and consuming it on the farm affects interstate commerce, on the far-fetched theory that it affects

the sum total of that material in the United States—in other words, that if a man did not raise a chicken he would have to get it from someone else if he was to eat it, and therefore that would affect interstate commerce.

So this measure affects any organization engaged in any activity, with the possible exception of a church which is not broadcasting the sermon. It brings all other persons under the terms of the proposed act.

I read further from the bill:

(2) under contract with the United States or any agency thereof or performing work, under subcontract or otherwise, called for by a contract to which the United States or any agency thereof is a party, awarded, negotiated, or renegotiated as hereinafter provided in section 13 of this act.

Mr. President, it may seem strange to have such language included in so comprehensive a bill as this one. I wonder why it was included. The language to which I have just referred would make the bill apply to all those who might have contracts with the United States, because it would be very unlikely for a person to have a contract with the United States if he had fewer than six persons employed by him. But this provision of the bill certainly shows the thoroughness with which those who engaged in this matter went about their task. They even provided that a person with fewer than six employees would have to abide by the provisions of this measure if he entered into a contract with the United States. Really, Mr. President, the only persons in the category not covered by that portion of the bill would be householders employing a servant or maid, and the bill would require even a person employing less than six persons to subject himself to its vicious provisions, if he had a contract with the United States.

Of course, another reason why that provision was included in the bill was to tie in with the provision, which appears in the latter part of the bill, that any man who has violated an order of this Commission and who has a contract with the United States will not be turned loose by the Commission after he has been put in jail. Oh, no, Mr. President; after he has had his regular punishment for his horrible crime of not obeying all the rules of the Commission, he will find that in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of section 13 of this measure the Commission still will have authority over him, even after he has served a jail sentence, after he has paid up all his back wages, after he has been punished for this thing of the mind which no one can establish with any degree of certainty—this so-called discrimination. Senators will find that for a period of 3 years such a firm can be prevented by the Commission from obtaining another contract with the Government. If that is not heaping injury on top of injury—after the man has already been punished by the courts and already has paid the penalty and already has paid up the back wage payments and already has suffered all the humiliation which has been heaped upon him—I do not know what it is. Just think of it, Mr. President, for the next 3 years he would have to live at the whim and will of the Commission,

and no Government contract would be awarded to him unless the Commission said it might be.

Mr. President, we have had discussed here, perhaps not in as much detail as we should have, but in some generality, the effect of the word "person" as contained in the bill, which I insist would make this Commission a gigantic employment agency for aliens. When I was interrupted by the Senator from New Mexico, I was stating that I did not think I had any more prejudice against aliens than does the average American citizen; that I do not subscribe to the theory of the present-day liberal saints who say that we must accord to aliens and to any person, anywhere in all the world, all the rights which we accord to the American people, or all the benefits or immunities or privileges which are inherent in one who is so blessed of Providence as to be a citizen of the United States. I cannot believe in that. I do not. I would be hypocritical if I were to say that I thought we should legislate here for the benefit of aliens, and to the detriment of the citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, I think we are not going to solve our problems by bringing aliens into this country. I deplore the fact that the President of the United States announced that he intended to bring in quite a large army of refugees just as soon as he could obtain transportation for them, and I am opposed to any relaxation of our immigration laws. That may be one of the inherent characteristics which stigmatize a southern Democrat; but they are my views, and I hold to them. I accord to any other Senator the right to advocate the bringing in of aliens and giving them jobs, to the detriment of American citizens; but I do not think that way, and I shall be compelled to oppose any such movement. The fact that that significance attaches to the word "person", as contained in the bill, the fact that the bill at no place differentiates between an alien and a citizen, is notice to any Senator who votes for it that he is voting to create a great employment agency to deal with finding employment for aliens.

Mr. President, I wish to point out—and I would that Senators would study the bill—the very remarkable powers which would be delegated to the Commission by the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator to speak to the question of immigration, with which he, as chairman of the Committee on Immigration, is so familiar. I do not wish to interfere with the development of the Senator's speech; but I wonder whether at this point I may ask him a few questions regarding immigration, in view of the fact that he is chairman of the Immigration Committee on which committee I have the pleasure of serving with him. I hope that by so doing I shall not interfere with the orderly presentation of the Senator's thoughts. If my question would do that, I would ask it at another time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator. I do not

think such questions will interfere with the orderly development of the presentation of this question and the analysis of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Georgia spoke of the question of immigration, and he made the point that he would be opposed to any further letting down of the bars in regard to immigration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; in fact, I would be willing still further to restrict immigration, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I understand the situation now existing in the Senate, no bills can be introduced at this time. However, I should like to refer to a bill which I intend to introduce, and I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia what he thinks of it. The proposed bill to which I refer reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. That until the expiration of 5 years after the date of enactment of this act no immigration visa shall be issued to any quota immigrant.

SEC. 2. Terms defined in the Immigration Act of 1924 shall, when used in this act, have the meaning assigned to such terms in that act.

Mr. President, it is my purpose to introduce that bill at the first opportunity I am able to obtain. I desire at this time to ask the Senator from Georgia, who is chairman of the Immigration Committee, to give us the benefit of his views regarding it. Perhaps I should not ask him to prejudge the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should prefer not to take snap judgment on a bill of such importance. As I have said, I would be willing still further to restrict immigration. I do not think I would be willing to go so far as absolutely to bar the entry of all hardship cases for a period of 5 years. We have been living in a very chaotic world; many families have been divided; many American citizens have been overseas and have not been able to return home. In order to prevent hardships I would not commit myself to a support of so comprehensive a bill. But I believe that we do not have sufficient room or wealth in this country to eradicate all the poverty, and cure all the sufferings of distressed mankind everywhere by admitting them into the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that today there are few jobs available to returning veterans?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not also a fact that today there are few homes which returning veterans may rent at reasonable rates?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is undoubtedly a housing shortage.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not also a fact that the returning veterans are meeting with a shortage of farm equipment, machinery, automobiles, and other articles?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the Senator believe that some restriction should

be placed upon immigration so that our own people may be supplied with the articles which it is necessary for them to have?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not say that there should be no further restrictions upon immigration. I have made the statement that I thought there should be. But the Senator has read a bill which seems to bar all immigration, and I would not want to support the bill without considering the matter further. I know there are hardship cases in many families. There are cases of members being separated, and they should be reunited. But I think that the opening of the door to a general swing of immigration would be detrimental to the rights of returning soldiers and other persons as well.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the Senator believe that hearings should be authorized on the bill so that we may ascertain the facts?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to see that the Senator's bill is considered by a subcommittee, and that it be considered fairly. I mean that it shall be considered fairly not in the sense that the pending bill is fair which is called a fair employment bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the pending bill also applies not only to any employer having more than six employees, wherever he may be and whatever may be the pursuits or activities in which he may be engaged, but it applies to any labor union having more than six members.

Mr. President, we now get down to the real remarkable fact in connection with this bill. We get down to the part of the bill which seeks to create a power enabling the Commission to override the President of the United States, to influence all the policies of Government, foreign or domestic, and to assure that aliens will be employed in any position, regardless of how delicately it may be related to the public welfare. I have before me subsection 4 (c) of the act. I hope Senators will read it carefully because, to me, it is the most outrageous legislative proposal I have encountered in 13 years as a Member of this body. The language to which I refer reads as follows:

(c) This act shall apply to the employment practices of the United States and of every Territory, insular possession, agency, or instrumentality thereof, except that paragraphs (e) and (f) of section 10, providing for petitions for enforcement and review, shall not apply in any case in which an order has been issued against any department or independent agency of the United States.

That language means that the act with respect to employment, or any claim of discrimination because of race, creed, color, origin, or ancestry, shall apply to employment practices of the United States and every agency or instrumentality thereof. That section should be considered because it repeals certain provisions for which Senators have voted during the last several years with regard to employment in the Federal Government. In the independent offices appropriation bill for 1946, now in

operation, is to be found the following provision:

Unless otherwise specified and until July 1, 1946, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States.

Mr. President, I shall not tire the Senate by reading all this act. Senators should be familiar with it because it was approved by the Senate as a matter of legislation, and is now a part of the law of the land, having been approved by the President of the United States.

It may be said, Mr. President, that such has been the policy for a number of years, with the exception of a few specified instances, the exceptions being made during the course of the war in order to obtain some interpreters, translators, and persons of that nature. The language states:

No person shall receive any funds that have been appropriated for the payment of salaries who is not a citizen of the United States.

That was in the law for some time. It was put into relief bills. A provision was put in one relief bill, Public Resolution No. 88, Seventy-sixth Congress, as follows:

No alien, no Communist, and no member of any Nazi bund organization shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution."

And so forth. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the entire paragraph be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the paragraph was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(f) No alien, no Communist, and no member of any Nazi bund organization shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution and no part of the money appropriated in this joint resolution shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit as to United States citizenship and to the effect that he is not a Communist and not a member of any Nazi bund organization, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship, and that he is not a Communist, and not a member of any Nazi bund organization.

Mr. RUSSELL. The language to which I have referred establishes, Mr. President, that such has been the policy of the Government of the United States as well as of the Congress of the United States. It was approved by the Senate of the United States. The Senate said that sums apportioned for the payment of salaries of persons working for the Government of the United States shall be paid only to citizens, and that aliens may not receive any part thereof.

There is a provision contained in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill with which I used to have some little familiarity. The provision reads:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

There are a half a dozen other provisions, every one of which would be repealed by this bill. The Congress should certainly give some consideration to the matter before it repeals provisions which limit employment by the Government of the United States and its agencies to citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, it is possible to get some subversive influence in the personnel of this Commission. I cannot look with very much hope to the prospect of the appointments when I view the qualifications and activities of some who have served on the present committee in its present status. But if certain persons ever receive an appointment to the Commission, and a majority of the Commission wants to take over the operations of the executive branch of the Government, Congress is asked in this bill to give them authority to do so. They can tell the President to jump into the lake at any time they wish to do so, and the President will have no option about it. If they send their representatives into a private enterprise and find that it is engaged in unfair employment practices according to the bill, they could by-pass the Federal district court and take an employer into the circuit court of appeals. He would have his hands tied behind him, because the law provides that if there is any evidence whatever against the employer, the court may do nothing in his behalf. Of course, that means that if he is convicted in the first instance he would stay out of court because he would save the expense of unnecessarily appearing. But with regard to the heads of Federal agencies, there is provided no court review. In a case where the commission has ordered the Federal Government to employ some person, the Fair Employment Practices Commission may petition the President for enforcement of such an order. Listen to this language. I assert without fear of successful contradiction that it or similar language has never been in any legislative subject matter before this body on any prior occasion. Listen to this language, beginning in line 22 on page 4:

And it shall thereafter be the duty of the President to take such measures as may secure obedience to any such order.

It does not say that the President of the United States may in his discretion enforce the order of this Commission. The Congress of the United States undertakes to make this Commission paramount and superior to the President, and make the President subservient to its will, which it does in specific terms.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I inquire what limitations are placed upon the power of the President after it is made mandatory that he act, and that he take such action to enforce decisions? What limitation is there on that power?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no limitation. The course ordered must be followed, whatever this Commission thinks should be done in a Federal agency. If they

think a certain man should have been promoted to a policy-making position, and say he was discriminated against because he happened to be a member of a minority, they report it to the President. If the President pays any attention to the Congress of the United States, we will have told him that "It is your mandatory duty," and we use the word "duty," that he "shall" do it, he "shall" enforce it.

Now, look at the next language:

Every officer, agent, or employee who willfully violates any such order—

That is, when the order has been given. Get the continuity between these two provisions. Whenever an order has been given to an officer and he violates it, he shall be summarily discharged from the Government employ. The way those things are tied together, this Commission can fire any man in the Federal Government, and the President, if he follows the clear wording of an act of Congress, would have no authority whatever to do anything about it. That is the English language, and it is clear. He who runs may read.

Mr. President, I have said this is the most skillfully drafted and designed piece of legislation ever presented to the Congress. I direct attention to section 5, which purports to provide for the establishment of the Commission. It says there shall be five Commissioners, to be appointed by the President. Listen to this. The President is to appoint them. I direct attention to line 13:

Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing—

For what?—

for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

Mr. President, I wonder how common that language is in the appointing power of the President. It is said he can appoint them and he can remove them, but only for malfeasance in office or for neglect of duty. If a man were made so incompetent that he could not even write his name, the President could not remove him. Why is this restriction thrown around the power of the President to remove members of the Commission, in connection with the mandatory language of the proposed act which says that the President "shall" bend the pregnant knee to carry out, as a mere lackey, any order which is forwarded to him by this supercommission Senators are seeking to establish here under the name of a Fair Practice Commission?

I say without any fear of successful contradiction that the President should be given the right of appeal, before this Commission discharges him, as it says he shall be discharged under the law—and Senators would be duly bound to impeach him if they could not get him out of office in any other way; but he should have some right of appeal. Notice how carefully in the employment policies of the Federal Government it is arranged so that this Commission shall be the sole and only arbiter of who shall work for the Federal Government. The President has no powers in the matter. Of course, back in the days when we thought that the Constitution as written

was the supreme law of the land, someone would have said that the Constitution makes the President the head of the executive branch. Of course, the Constitution has no effect in this day, and the Congress says in specific terms, in the proposed bill, in words which do not permit of any quibble or equivocation, that the President shall carry out any order this outrageous organization might issue, and he will have no discretion whatever in the matter. Congress declares, along with all the other declarations here, that it is the President's duty immediately to carry out such an order, whether he wants to or not. Senators cannot say that is a strained construction of the provision. I challenge anyone to put any other interpretation on it without distorting the English language.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, under the terms of the bill, the President shall take such measures as may secure obedience to such an order. What are the limitations on the measures which may be taken?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no limitation; but I am assuming that the worst thing that will happen to one will be that he will be summarily discharged from the Government employ.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The next sentence provides for that, but suppose the order is made against an individual rather than an officer?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was undoubtedly the purpose of this language to make the President subservient to the Commission, insofar as handling employment policies of the Federal Government was concerned. I assume, then, that the Commission would tell the President what measures he should take.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, there is no discretion reposed in the President, after the Commission once makes a finding and issues an order thereon.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is just as much discretion in the President as will be found in the word "shall." If there is any discretion in the word "shall," there will be discretion in the President, but the word "shall" has been recognized in this body since time immemorial as the word to use to create a mandatory duty; so the bill proposes to make this Commission superior to the President.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask the Senator whether the President would have opportunity for discretion, or review of the order made, to determine whether it was fair and equitable, based on facts established which showed discrimination or violation of the policies announced by the act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not in the slightest degree. Not only that, but in section 5 Congress tells the President he cannot remove these people for telling him to do something he does not want to do. Of course, if he undertook to remove them, even for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, they would have a right to assemble themselves, and if Senators will look at the complexion of the boards which have existed in the past, with one or two exceptions, they will agree they could assemble and say, "The President says he is removing us because we stole

a lot of money that belonged to the Federal Government, but that is not the case. He is really trying to remove us and discriminate against us because we are members of a certain minority group." The Board would get together and determine that the President was discriminating against them, and it would be impossible ever to get them out, and there would be established an agency in the Federal Government which no one could handle, unless Congress should get up the courage to make the attempt, and, judging by the past, I have no hope of that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the Senator's interpretation, with which I agree, all the Board would have to do would be to issue another order to the President to desist.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, they would determine about discrimination. The Senator has seen the personnel of these boards, like the so-called Fair Employment Committee we have had.

Mr. President, there is another provision of the bill which is worthy of brief comment, anyway. I think Senators should consider it, because it is a rather important piece of legislation within itself. I refer to section 8 of the bill, which reads:

Upon the appointment of the members of the Commission, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, established by Executive Order No. 9346 of May 27, 1943, shall cease to exist.

If that were all there were in the bill, if the words "shall cease to exist" were the only language in the bill, with what enthusiasm I could support it! But it continues:

All employees of the said Committee shall be transferred to and become employees of the Commission. All records, papers, and property of the Committee shall pass into the possession of the Commission, and all unexpended funds and appropriations for the use and maintenance of the Committee shall be available to the Commission.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. WHITE. On page 4, in subparagraph (c), it is provided that—

The Fair Employment Practice Commission established by section 5 of this act may petition the President for the enforcement of any such lawful order, and it shall thereupon be the duty of the President to take such measures as may secure obedience to any such order.

Of course, in late years we have grown somewhat familiar with directives moving from the President, but this is the first instance within my knowledge of a suggestion that a subordinate of the Executive would have the right to issue directives to the President.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator just stepped off the floor when I began to discuss that point. I challenged anyone to show any legislative precedent for the Congress subordinating the President to the Board and making him a lackey and compelling him to carry out their orders as to employment in the Federal Government, whether he thinks it proper or not.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has already commented on what I have read. But the following language intrigues me somewhat:

It shall thereupon be the duty of the President to take such measures as may secure obedience to any such order.

Now what are those orders on which the President may take action? May he do anything or everything that he would like to do?

Mr. RUSSELL. The mildest punishment that could be inflicted under that language would be to discharge the man. I do not know whether he could be deprived of any other rights, or of his liberty. I hardly think the President could exile him, but if the Commission ordered the President to exile him he would have to try to do so, and the man would have no recourse to the courts.

Mr. WHITE. But there is nothing in this proposed legislation which undertakes to define the powers which the President may exercise.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not the slightest. Nor is there any definition. I am complaining here about bringing in a bill of this revolutionary character and that the sponsors do not try to define it, or to provide protection to the individual who has to deal with these kangaroo courts. No standards are set up. No definition is provided. No rights on earth are left to the average everyday citizen except to go to jail, without the benefit of a jury trial, and without a hearing in the sense that is commonly accepted under our law in a court of justice. That is what the bill does.

Mr. President, as I stated, section 8 on its face may appear to be a very harmless and insignificant section. It provides that when and if this bill is passed, the committee which President Roosevelt appointed shall cease to exist, and then it transfers all the employees of the committee to become the employees of the commission. That is a significant provision. Why does it have to be in this bill? The employees are entitled to the same consideration, and to no more and to no less consideration, than other civil-service employees are entitled to. In my opinion, the language is in the bill because of the fact that it has been stated, and never been denied, that a goodly number of the employees of this agency have been members of organizations which have been branded by the Attorney General of the United States—and I refer to Attorney General Biddle, a great liberal, and not some hide-bound attorney general—as subversive in their nature, some of them even undertaking to change our form of government by force and violence.

Therefore, as I say, there is not a line of this bill that is not without a purpose to take care of that group and slide them into office at the very inception. Government employees are being laid off in all other agencies, but these employees are being given preference and priorities, every one of them taken care of and slid over into other agencies, perhaps because they are already trained and know their way around in their subversive and destructive efforts.

Now, Mr. President, we have come to section 9 which has to do with the location of the offices of this transitory, nebulous, fleeting, here-today and gone-tomorrow, star-chamber method of imposing upon the people of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has been discussing section 8, regarding the employees. Does the Senator construe the section to provide, in addition to the radicals who have been spoken of, that the Commission shall take over the employees in the same proportion in which the Fair Employment Practice Committee now hires employees, which proportion was such as the Senator so ably mentioned and discussed last summer when appropriations for the FEPC was under consideration?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. Of course we have pointed out that the FEPC is supposed to provide against discrimination, but out of 169 employees, about three-quarters, or 120-odd, were members of the Negro race, and thus it is developed that it was not against the law to discriminate in favor of, but only against the law to discriminate against. You can discriminate in favor of all you please.

The only thing that is tied down at all respecting this organization, the only thing that is definite about it in the slightest degree is the fact that the Commission must meet some times in the District of Columbia. That is the only thing definite about it. The Commission must meet here. But the Commission may meet at such other places as its members may designate. They can pull a poor fellow to Washington today and try him in St. Louis tomorrow before the Commission.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the terms of this bill, as I read it, there is no reason why they could not hold a session in Alaska, and take a Georgia citizen to Alaska and examine him there.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not require the Commission to operate within the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Or it can operate in any other Territory.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it can operate anywhere it wants to. It would be a rather nice Commission to be a member of if one wanted to take junkets. But I can warn any Senator who thinks he may be likely to be placed on the Commission if the Commission is created he will be disappointed. There will be on this Commission representatives only of the colored race, of labor organizations, and of minority groups. So a Senator would not have much opportunity of becoming a member of it.

Mr. President, here is a very wide sweep of power:

The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such referees, agents,

or agencies as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry or conduct any hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States or any Territory or insular possession thereof.

I do not exactly understand this use of the word "agencies" in this section. I have endeavored to study the bill, and I have tried to probe the mind of the man who drafted the bill, whoever he may be, because as I saw the tortuous course of this language and the unusual powers it sought to confer in this Commission, the unusual powers it took from the other agencies of government, and the great restrictions placed upon the individual citizens of this country, I knew that there was some motive back of the bill, and I could pretty soon pick up what the motive was, and that was very helpful in analyzing the bill. But I have not understood the use of the word "agencies" to prosecute these inquiries. I do not know whether that means a private agency or public agency. I do not know whether it means an individual operating as an agency or whether it means that this Commission could employ some political organization, such as the Communist Party, or some Union for Democratic Action, or some such agency as that to prosecute these inquiries. I do not think that it is necessary to delegate this to this Commission. Where they have their representatives to sit as a judge and as a prosecuting attorney and the jury all at one time, it would seem that it would not be necessary to bring in outside agencies to help conduct the prosecution. Certainly, Mr. President, where a man sits as judge and jury and as prosecutor he does not need any additional power. He is bound by no rules. He is under no law, save his own conscience. He does not need to be able to secure any agency, and I wish I knew just what the draftsman meant when he put the word "agency" in the bill.

Mr. President, we have already discussed, through the questions that have been asked here on the floor of the Senate, the unusual powers which are granted to the Commission and the number of essential rights which are denied those who are charged with offenses, the rights of the individuals. I want to reiterate that there has never been such a court as this ever conceived of in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. Under the bill practically the only right a man has is to employ counsel and to appear personally. There is no assurance that he will be confronted with the witnesses against him. The old-fashioned idea was that before a man was found guilty of a crime he should be confronted by the witnesses against him. That right is done away with in this bill. He does not have to be confronted with the witnesses. He has no fundamental right of cross-examination of the witnesses. The only right that is assured him by the bill is the right to testify. He may appear and testify. He has no protection of a rule of evidence. He has no right of cross-examination conferred by law. He has no benefit of the rules of evidence which have been accepted in this Nation through all these many

years. As I have stated, if he is found guilty he has no method of review.

Broad investigatory powers are proposed to be conferred on the Commission. Senators may treat this subject lightly if they choose, but let them wait until the harassed, annoyed, badgered, beaten, and confused businessmen of this country, those who employ more than six persons, come in to complain about the administration of the act. Senators need not say that they did not have any idea that such a thing could occur. They have been put on notice that it can and will happen if this bill ever becomes a law.

As I have stated, the agents of the Commission would have the right of access to all the books of the individual or concern under investigation, without any warrant or authority in law whatever. Any resistance to an examination of those books is specifically made a crime, punishable by imprisonment of 1 year and a fine of \$5,000. The right which we thought we had under the fourth amendment, under the old concept of construing the Constitution as it is written and accepted as the supreme law of the land, would disappear, because the agent could go through the books of an individual or a corporation as he saw fit, without any warrant or authority. If an individual should refuse to obey a subpoena from this organization, or refuse to adhere to its determinations, he could be brought before the court and sentenced to jail for as long as the judge saw fit. He would have no right to protect himself.

Under the terms of the proposed law, if there were any evidence against him it would be the duty of the circuit court of appeals to find him guilty. The circuit court of appeals might say, "This is the most outrageous perversion of justice that we have ever seen in our lives. The defendant was convicted on the testimony of one witness who was shown by the record to be prejudiced against him for other reasons. The defendant produced more than 100 witnesses, prominent men of high character, who testified in his behalf, but the examiner of the FEPC found him guilty, and because that one prejudiced witness appeared against the defendant the circuit court of appeals has no power on earth to afford him any redress."

Mr. President, there are other provisions creeping into our law in this day when Senators talk against bureaucracy and vote to create new bureaus with greater powers. I point out subsection (c) of section 11, on page 11—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the proposed permanent organization be given more power than was conferred upon the temporary Committee established by Executive order?

Mr. RUSSELL. I discussed that question earlier in the course of my remarks. There is no comparison. Under the present system, all that the present Committee on Fair Employment Practices can do is to say that a man shall be denied a contract with the Federal Government if he does not follow such employment

practices. The Committee does not even have that power. It must invoke the aid of the War Department or the President. It has no right to bring a man into court. It has no right to examine his books. The present law applies only to the agencies of the Federal Government, and to those who have contracts with the United States. The bill before us would apply to every person, natural, or artificial, who employs more than six persons in any line of work. The bill not only provides for the cancellation of a Government contract if the employer does not do as the Commission directs. It provides that the accused may be put in jail. He is denied the right to trial by jury. He cannot get before a jury.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was absent from the Chamber when the Senator no doubt explained the provisions of subsection (d), beginning near the bottom of page 7. If the Senator can do so without being diverted too far from the discussion of the provision on page 12, I should like to have him state his views with respect to subsection (d) of section 10, beginning near the bottom of page 7 and continuing on page 8, requiring the accused person "to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of this act."

How far does the Senator think the Commission might go? How much authority would it have under this subsection?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, the Senator is referring to subsection (d) of section 10, beginning on page 7.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and particularly to lines 1 and 2 on page 8, with respect to the affirmative action which must be taken.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not see any limit to the authority. I do not think there is any limit to how far the Commission might go. That illustrates the negligence of the Congress in attempting to legislate in such a haphazard fashion. Of course, the provision with respect to back pay is intended to serve as a club over the employer to make him discriminate against those who are not protected by the terms of the bill.

Of course, the Senator has noticed subsection (b) on page 7, which begins with the language—

Whenever it is alleged that any person has engaged in any such unfair employment practice—

It does not say that the person offended against must allege it. On the basis of an anonymous telephone call to the effect that any individual has engaged in an unfair employment practice, the Commission might send its representative to examine his books, and he might be cited before the Commission. It is the widest grant of power that has ever been considered by the Congress of the United States. I state that without any fear of contradiction.

Mr. WHERRY. Have any hearings been held on that particular subject?

Mr. RUSSELL. I ran through the hearings. I wanted to see how much con-

sideration had been given to the rather remarkable statement of findings and declaration of policy on page 1 of the bill.

A great number of witnesses appeared before the Committee on Education and Labor. In his report the Senator from New Mexico estimates that the witnesses who appeared before the committee spoke for 120,000,000 people. He stated that there appeared a representative of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and that he represented a great many people. An eminent Catholic divine appeared, who it is said represented approximately 22,000,000 people. A Jewish rabbi represented four or five million more. A member of a Negro organization was also present. The Senator from New Mexico compiled the list of witnesses, and he states that his report speaks the voice of between 125,000,000 and 130,000,000 people. I believe that that statement is in line with other statements in the report, and the provisions of the bill. It is just about as exaggerated. I have no idea that those witnesses spoke for any such number of people. Undoubtedly they told the committee that they were for fair-employment practices. Every fair-minded man in the United States is for fair-employment practices, and no doubt the witnesses vigorously defended fair-employment practices before the committee. But no one had then pointed out how the kangaroo courts proposed to be created by the bill would destroy the rights of individual Americans in and to their business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to have my position misunderstood. I am one of those who believe in fair-employment practices. I have been a strong advocate of constructive legislation to that end; but I am very apprehensive. I should like to have an explanation from the proponents of this measure, if we can get it as we go along, with respect to certain sections of the bill which certainly go beyond the powers of the present Committee on Fair Employment Practice, which was established by Executive order. Regardless of the fact that the Senator from Georgia and I are not in full agreement on the philosophy of a fair employment practice act—

Mr. RUSSELL. I refuse to admit that the Senator from Nebraska is a stronger advocate of real fair-employment practices than I am. We may differ on the question of approach.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me put it this way: Even though we may be in disagreement as to this particular measure—and I do not know that we are—I should like to find out how far the bill goes. I have a high regard for the judgment and sincerity of the Senator from Georgia, as I believe the Senator knows. I have held him in high esteem ever since I first became a Member of the Senate. I have been with him on a number of questions.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not saying that to flatter the Senator. I may not agree with his interpretation, but I should like to obtain from him an expression on this section. I suggest to the Senator from

New Mexico, who is sponsoring the bill, that as we go along we should have a definite interpretation as to how far the proposed authority goes, and what right of appeal would exist. I want to see the rights of every American protected when it comes to the legal aspects of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have been most happy all afternoon because the Senator from Georgia has discussed the bill from the standpoint of merit, from the legal standpoint as he understands it. He has made some very fine statements this afternoon. I am a strong proponent of the proposed legislation. I may say that it is the purpose of those who may disagree with the legal conclusions of the Senator from Georgia to present their views on the legal questions involved as soon as we are through approving the prayer and the Journal. I wish to thank the Senator from Georgia for the effort which he has made this afternoon to discuss the bill in the way it should be discussed, from the legal standpoint, and from the standpoint of its implications, as the Senator understands them, as well as from the standpoint of the effect upon the American people.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for doing that, even if I do not reach the same conclusion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind comment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Now I shall sum up some of my objections to this bill, and then I shall conclude.

I am opposed to this bill. I am opposed to the philosophy of attempting to legislate and create a new penal offense which cannot be determined to a reasonable certainty and with reasonable fairness before a reasonably fair court in this country, a bill which affects the rights of every individual American citizen.

I am opposed to the nationalization of jobs in this country by permitting the Government of the United States or any of its creatures to determine whom any employer shall fire, whom he shall hire, or whom he shall promote, merely because the person concerned happens to be a member of a minority group.

I am opposed to this proposed legislation, Mr. President, because it would give to some American citizens and to some aliens in minority groups rights, privileges, and benefits which would be denied other American citizens, including those who have fought in our behalf in the recent great war.

I am opposed to the bill because I know that any effort to regulate and control the tastes and habits and manners of a great people such as ours is doomed to failure from the outset. It has been tried but it has never worked, and it cannot work now.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a small advertisement which the wife of a distinguished Member of this body, who is not from the South, happened to see in a Washington newspaper, and she cut it out and it came into my hands. It shows the futility of trying to legislate in connection with a matter of this kind. This

good lady was looking through the want ads, trying to find a maid; her maid had left her. She happened to notice this advertisement in the Washington Evening Star of September 28, 1945:

Girl, colored, wants general housework, plain cook, 5-day week, Monday through Friday, adults; gentiles; \$20 and car fare a week.

How are we going to reach by legislation a matter of that kind, when a colored maid prefers to work for gentiles rather than for Jews? Can you create a commission to handle that? You can do it if you have the right to say that under the commerce clause of the Constitution, a person cannot employ or promote according to his judgment. You can do it if you are willing to strike down and destroy rights guaranteed all our people by the Constitution of the United States.

Of course, if the Congress has the power under the commerce clause to take away a fundamental right of one person to his property and business by saying whom he must employ, it would have the right to wipe out another constitutional provision on the question of involuntary servitude and say by statute that a person must work at a certain job lest the commerce of the Nation be obstructed. Neither can be done unless we are ready to wipe out the constitutional rights guaranteed all of the people of the United States, whether majority or minority. Such action can but result in a form of government where all of the rights and privileges which should be vested in a free people are taken over by that government. God forbid that the day should be here when Senators are willing to set in motion a force which will nationalize industry today and will tomorrow sovietize this country and permit us to attach the employee to the factory as a part thereof.

The individual in this country is still supposed to have some rights. The crimes which this outrageous measure attempts to place upon the statutes are all matters of the mind. Exact proof can never be had to establish a question of taste. It can only result in injustices and the destruction of individual rights. Any such method is wholly and completely un-American and subversive to our form of government, our vaunted rights of citizenship, and the way of life which has made us the greatest nation of the earth.

We may belong to various races, various churches; we may have different patterns of behavior; we may even have different standards or types of life in different sections of our country. That is America. When we undertake to say what is in the mind of a person who says he would prefer to have John Jones work for him, rather than Jim Smith, or that he prefers to promote John Doe rather than Bill Roe, and when we undertake to say that when he does that he does it because he discriminates against a particular political faith or religious faith or creed or race, Mr. President, I say that the Senate of the United States should have better sense than to attempt to do it, and we should have the courage

to say so, rather than to continue to mess around with such a measure as this one.

Mr. MAYBANK rose.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina; in fact, I am prepared to yield the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the advertisement to which the Senator has referred, I was merely going to ask him if he recalls the answer which was given by Mr. Maslow when he was asked how the complaints originated. During the hearings Mr. Maslow said:

Our staff has been specifically instructed not to proceed except on the basis of a complaint made by a complainant, or referred by a Government agency. The only exception, sir, is in the case of discriminatory advertisements.

I also wish to ask the Senator if he likewise recalls the following answer given by Mr. Maslow, when he referred to the Dallas News case:

The regional director, scanning the newspapers, believed he saw an example of a violation of the order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, Mr. President, under the rules which would be adopted by the Commission, any such advertisement as that one, which was inserted in the newspaper by a colored maid, would be illegal. I do not know that the Commission would provide for punishment of the maid, but they would put the newspaper publisher in jail if he published in his newspaper an advertisement mentioning a minority race, even if the person paying for the advertisement wished to have it printed in the newspaper. The Commission would put the newspaper publisher in jail if he published an advertisement which even by implication indicated a preference not to work for a Semitic family.

So, Mr. President, let us do away with the desire to play up to this or to that minority group. Let us lay this dangerous bill aside; and, in accord with the desire to serve the worthy and the better traditions of the Senate in the days gone by, let us dedicate ourselves to legislation which will steer us safely through the perilous storms which beat about us at this time. In so doing, we will protect the rights and promote the happiness of all our people.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 43, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of each part of the hearings held before said joint committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, a concurrent resolution to investigate the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and events and circumstances relating thereto.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communi-

cated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

JOURNAL OF THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. OVERTON to amend the Journal of the proceedings of the Senate of Thursday, January 17, 1946.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bailey	Hart	Morse
Ball	Hayden	Revercomb
Briggs	Hoey	Russell
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	La Follette	Stanfill
Cordon	McClellan	Stewart
Donnell	McKellar	Taft
Eastland	McMahon	Wherry
Ellender	Mead	White
Gerry	Millikin	Wiley

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STEWART. Am I correct in understanding that the motion of the Senator from Oregon is that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEWART. Is the Senator's remark in the nature of a motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It must be in the nature of a motion.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STEWART. This is more in the nature of a point of order. I understand that the rules of the Senate provide that in the absence of a quorum no motion may be made except a motion to adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian, who is a good one, that the motion which has just been made by the Senator from Oregon is in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Oregon is clearly in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of

the Senator from Oregon that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

On a division the motion was agreed to. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this point rule V, paragraph 3, which is the rule controlling in this situation, will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Whenever upon such roll call it shall be ascertained that a quorum is not present, a majority of the Senators present may direct the Sergeant at Arms to request, and, when necessary, to compel the attendance of the absent Senators, which order shall be determined without debate; and pending its execution, and until a quorum shall be present, no debate nor motion, except to adjourn, shall be in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. ROBERTSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, is a motion to recess in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would not be in order in the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is a motion to adjourn in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I know the order of business will be changed, but I am within my rights, and as it is perfectly apparent to me that an hour will be wasted in an absolutely futile way, I make a motion that the Senate now adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. WHITE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and will vote. I vote "nay." I am not advised how the Senator from New Hampshire would vote if present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT], the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. MITCHELL], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained at a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now being held in London.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] is absent on official business as a member of the Mead committee.

I wish to announce further that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now being held in London.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent on official business as a member of the Mead committee.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is detained on official departmental business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily detained on official business trying to get a settlement on the truck strike with the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Schwellenbach.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—24

Bailey	Hayden	Millikin
Bankhead	Hill	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hoey	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Eastland	McCarran	Russell
Ellender	McClellan	Stewart
Fulbright	McKellar	Tydings
Hatch	Maybank	Wiley

NAYS—33

Austin	Hickenlooper	Shipstead
Ball	Huffman	Smith
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Stanfill
Butler	Kilgore	Taft
Capper	La Follette	Taylor
Chavez	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McMahon	Tobey
Donnell	Mead	Walsh
Ferguson	Morse	White
Gurney	Pepper	Willis
Hart	Saitonstall	Young

NOT VOTING—39

Alken	Gerry	Murray
Andrews	Glass	Myers
Barkley	Gossett	O'Daniel
Brewster	Green	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Guffey	Overtton
Brooks	Hawkes	Reed
Bushfield	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Tunnell
Caphart	McFarland	Vandenberg
Carville	Magnuson	Wagner
Connally	Mitchell	Wheeler
Downey	Moore	Wherry
George	Murdock	Wilson

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a quorum is now present, as disclosed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is now present.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I understand the authors of the bill under consideration are Senators CHAVEZ, DOWNEY, WAGNER, MURRAY, CAPPER, LANGER, and AIKEN.

I have been asked by some of my constituents if the authors of the bill will consider and approve an amendment to section 3, paragraph 1, after the word "ancestry," to add the words "or because of his membership in or lack of membership in a union." I should love to have a public answer to that question so that I could notify my constituents accordingly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would love to give the Senator from Maryland an answer to his question, which I think is a fair question, but I am not in a position to do it until we at least approve the Journal of Thursday, January 17.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish to get into this debate, and I can understand, in a great democracy such as ours, where every man has equality, that there can be those who think that there should be some measure of law to safeguard a person's right to work because of his race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, and, in order to make it all-inclusive, bring all citizens into its purview and make them all equal. I would assume that those who favor this proposal would have no objection to the inclusion of the word "or because of his membership in or lack of membership in a union."

If there is to be no discrimination, if there is to be that measure of sheer, honest-thinking and forthrightness which all the proponents of the measure seem to advocate, I will ask any Senator on the other side of the aisle or on this side, who favors the bill as it stands, if he would support such an amendment to the bill? I do not want to call individual names, but it is pretty clear to me where the majority here stand; that they do not want any discrimination at all in the right to work, and I am assuming, unless I am contradicted, that all those who are supporting this bill, as is evidenced by the roll call, will support the amendment I have proposed. I take it that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] who is standing will do it; that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] will do it; that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] will do

it; that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] will do it; that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] will do it; that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] will do it; that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] will do it; and practically all the other Senators on that side of the aisle, and I am certain that there will not be a discordant vote from the Democratic Party, which stands for liberty and equality in the true Jeffersonian sense.

Is not this a sheer case of hypocrisy, for in spite of what I said, I doubt if there is sufficient moral courage in this body to make good on the professed policy of the pending bill?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I will support the Senator's proposal.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. I like to see a courageous man rise in this body.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will not support it, and I will not support any of the rest of it.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is another courageous man. Both those positions are understandable. How many more volunteers do we have? Have we any more volunteers? Yet nobody in America, according to the philosophy of this bill, is to be denied the God-given right to earn a living in the sweat of his own brow.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will make plain my position. I will not support the Senator's proposition, simply because I am for the working man. I know that he will be paid a dollar a day for 14 hours if he does not have unions. The union is worthless without a closed shop. So I will not support the proposal. But I do not want to see anybody discriminated against because of race, creed, or color, or religious belief.

Mr. TYDINGS. Now there is another position we can understand. The Senator from Idaho says unless a man belongs to a union he has no right to work. That is clear, that no one shall work in this country who does not belong to a union. We have three brave men so far. I can understand each one of those three positions. They are not any of them in agreement with the other, but at least they are candid. We are making headway.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. There is still one more position. I will not support the Senator's proposed amendment, which, by the way, the Senator has not offered.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not proposing it. I am merely asking those who support this bill if they really mean what they say.

Mr. GURNEY. I say I would not support the Senator's amendment to this bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is not my amendment. It is a suggested proposal. I am not offering any amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. I will support the Senator's proposal as a separate piece of legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is candid and understandable. We have four men here who can stand up and be counted. I am sorry that the authors of the bill, who certainly by every inference have thought more about it than all the others of us put together, are not equally candid.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. All the moral courage does not belong to the State of Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not have any more than my share, but at least I know hypocrisy from the truth when I see it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right, and I can understand it once in a while in someone else.

Mr. President, since the Senator has the moral courage to stand here and make the suggestion he has made, will he vote for cloture so he can offer his amendment and the Senate can vote "yea" or "nay" on it?

Mr. TYDINGS. No, I will not vote for cloture, and I will tell the Senator why. Cloture is predicated upon the theory that the majority can do no wrong; cloture is predicated on the assumption that might makes right; cloture is predicated on the idea that the voice of the individual, for which this country was founded, for which the Constitution was written, for which the Bill of Rights was brought into being, is to be set at naught. It was cloture that crucified Christ on the Cross; it was cloture that put to work the hangman on a thousand gallows through all the Dark Ages. No, the right of protest is one of the strongest guaranties of human rights and liberty left in this or any other republic. It was those who fought cloture who went to the dungeons and prison camps in Germany. Niemöller was one of them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, I will yield; but I do not want to become diverted to a discussion of the question of cloture. I have answered that question. I want to get on with the main bout; not with the side show. I want to know how many volunteers there are who will make this great right for humanity cover the whole field. Now let us be frank about it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I ask, is not democracy predicated upon rule of the majority?

Mr. TYDINGS. The rule of the majority! The rule of votes! Majority to hades! The rule of petty political preference! The rule of the majority! The rule that has brought more bloodshed and turmoil and cruelty on this earth than any other thing I know of! Of course it is necessary to have it as a yardstick in order to do business, but let us not fool ourselves with the silly thought that majorities are always right. It was

the majority in this body that struck down the League of Nations, and it was the majority in this body that raised the UNO to eminence.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, I will yield in a moment. It was the majority in this body that put over the Washington Naval Disarmament Conference, and left this country relatively unprepared for World War II.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not a question of whether it is right or wrong; it is a question of what the majority wants.

Mr. TYDINGS. My conscience, bad though it may be, is not controlled by the majority. Thank God, that at least is still in my individual keeping, and no power of government can ever take it away from me. This is simply a political shenanigan, and with few exceptions the Republican Party is determined to make capital with the colored vote. Let us have some truth in this body; that is all. All this talk about night sessions and what not—what for? Are Senators on the other side of the aisle burning with any sense of great wrong, because some segment of our population is being mistreated, and are tears of sorrow flowing down their political cheeks? Not at all. Sheer politics!

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SMITH. So far as I am concerned, I take issue with the statement made by the Senator that this is simply a political shenanigan. I am deeply concerned at this moment in our history with the question of discrimination between individuals in the matter of equality of opportunity in education and in work by reason of race, creed, or color. That is the only issue raised by this bill. That is why I stand for the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. I exculpate the Senator from New Jersey, because I think that among the Members of this body he is preeminent in having a mind that is detached from any political considerations, and I tender him my most respectful and humble apologies. But the Senator knows that my arrow has not missed all the marks either on that side of the aisle or on this side. I think we have come to a pretty pass when we take one section of our people and utilize them purely for political purposes. There are Senators voting for this bill who would move out of a hotel if a colored man came into the dining room and sat down at the table with him.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say that I live one block from the colored section, and I did not object to buying a house because it was there. My only regret is that it is not in the colored section. If I had it to do again I would deliberately buy one there.

Mr. TYDINGS. I admire the Senator's candor, which I must say is the exception rather than the rule.

How many Senators would continue to live in the apartment house in which they may now live, if it were inhabited

equally by other citizens of our country whose color is different from theirs? Stand up! Stand up! Let us have some exhibitions of the equality about which we are all boasting here. I do not see any Senator standing. I take it for granted then—

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is confusing some very important issues.

Mr. TYDINGS. What are they?

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is confusing the question of social equality with the question of equality of opportunity in education and in work. I think it is unfortunate that the social question should be brought up when we are discussing something much more fundamental and much more important. I hope the Senate will make its position known upon the question now before us in the very near future.

Mr. TYDINGS. What we are discussing in the very last analysis is the sovereign equality of men of every race, color, or creed in this Republic, to have no prohibition applied to them to prevent their having what all the rest of us have. Am I wrong? If so, I will be glad to have someone point out wherein I am wrong.

Mr. SMITH. I do not understand the Senator's point.

Mr. TYDINGS. I say that what we are discussing is the right of every man to have work no matter what his race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry may be. Am I right?

Mr. SMITH. I am not sure of the exact wording—

Mr. TYDINGS. It is from the bill.

Mr. SMITH. It provides for equality of opportunity for work, irrespective of color, race, or creed.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not wish to become personal, but I ask the Senator whether he would favor opening hotels in the District to colored people by law?

Mr. SMITH. I certainly would not open a hotel anywhere by law.

Mr. TYDINGS. What good is the right to work if one cannot realize equality in respect to the rewards of his work?

Mr. SMITH. I do not agree with the Senator that the question of social equality is involved in the question of equality of opportunity in education and work.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is at least candid; but the sole implication of the bill is that there is to be no discrimination against citizens under this flag, no matter what their race may be.

Mr. SMITH. Some of the Senator's distinguished colleagues raised the point that this involves intermarriage of the races. It has nothing to do with it. It would be most unfortunate to raise that issue. That is not the issue involved in the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not going to raise that issue.

Mr. SMITH. The implication is—

Mr. TYDINGS. But I should like to present the issue of whether or not a man has the right to acquire with the fruits of his labor equal objects, personal, real, or indefinite.

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to say this much to the distinguished Senator: I have been abroad a good deal. I have been in England, and I have seen people of dark color, whom we are discussing, received in the finest places in England. They happened to come from India. They were looked upon as citizens, as much as anyone else. We cannot accomplish that result in this country overnight. We can progress toward an understanding of these people, for whom we have a very deep responsibility. I feel that the American people have been to blame for the condition in which they find themselves, and for keeping them submerged because of a prejudice based upon color. To my mind that is unthinkable in free America.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment. I return to my original statement, that it is not consistent to give a man, because he may be of a different color than a white man, the right to work by law, and deprive him of the right to utilize the fruits of his labor in direct equality with any other citizen. If one proposition is consistent, the other follows as night follows the day.

Mr. SMITH. It might follow in the course of time; but it does not seem to me proper to raise that issue now, as though social equality were required at this moment. What we want to do is to give these people an education and an opportunity to work. To my mind that is a totally different issue. I hope to see the whole thing accomplished in time. It will take time. However, I believe that we are entitled to take steps slowly toward a condition of equality, irrespective of race, creed, and color.

One of the greatest issues, in addition to the color question, is the question of creed. Let us not mince words. We know perfectly well that people of certain religious faiths are discriminated against, and I feel that we must fight until such discriminations are removed in this postwar period, in building up a new America. If we are to have unity throughout our entire country, which will be the only thing that will bring about production and make us again a united people, we must remove such discriminations. Unity in America today is the most important single issue.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am in complete agreement with the Senator's philosophy. I do not take issue with what he has said. I am only trying to apply the philosophy to the realities of life. Theories do not put bread in the mouths of the people, strike down iron bars, make them intelligent, or give them privileges. Only acts which flow from theories make such things realities.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to add this thought: I agree with the Senator as to realities. It is for that reason that I feel that it is unfortunate at this time to try to make it appear that this is a social issue, and not an issue of equality of opportunity in education and occupation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Some men view the question as one of material equality, and not social equality. The Senator has

been candid. He has stated, in effect, that he believes that every man should have the right to work, regardless of his race, color, or creed, but that he ought not to have social equality.

Mr. SMITH. I would not say that he ought not to have it. I should say that we cannot force social equality under the present unfortunate conditions in our country. I should like to see the time come when that hope may be realized; but I believe that it is most unfortunate and regrettable to force that issue now, in order to prejudice the people against equality of opportunity.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Maryland spoke of colored persons going to a hotel in Washington. Let me remind him that if a colored person, no matter how dark his skin might be, happened to come from India or Arabia, he could go to any hotel in Washington and obtain a room, and no good American white people would move out.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. The only colored people against whom we discriminate are our own citizens.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. The only people against whom we discriminate are those whom our forefathers brought over here against their will.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. I think it is an issue.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. If we have been fighting a war for freedom and equality of opportunity, I think it is about time for us to begin to apply that theory in the United States. That is why I think the bill is important.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not quarrel with the Senator. He has been candid. He will carry his idea through to a logical conclusion.

Mr. BALL. I will.

Mr. TYDINGS. I admire the Senator for having thought out the question. He knows where he stands. It is not essential that I agree with him or disagree with him. The point is that he has thought out the question, and is consistent to the end.

The point I wish to make is that the authors of the bill would deny to a large section of our population what the Senator from Minnesota is ready to give to all people, regardless of race, color, creed, or what not.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why does the Senator say that the authors of the bill would deny it?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator knows that in many cases a man has not the right to work if he does not belong to a union.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator is so brave and courageous, I hope he will let us have the Journal approved so that he may offer an amendment. He is talking about a hypothetical question which might arise, but he does not say that he intends to offer such an amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Maryland does not have to say it, because when the Wagner Act was before us for consideration the Senator from Maryland offered such an amendment to the Wagner Act, and spoke in behalf of the amendment. When it was not included in that measure, the Senator from Maryland voted against the Wagner Act. The Senator from Maryland did not trim then, and he is not trimming now. I did not vote for the Wagner Act because I had tried on the floor of the Senate, when that measure was under consideration, to have an amendment adopted providing that labor should not be coerced or intimidated from any source whatsoever; and the Senate of the United States struck down that amendment. Why? Not because it did not believe in it, but because those who controlled large blocs of citizens sent word here that they did not want that amendment. Here we indulge in the farce of saying in a formal statement that no man shall be denied a job because of his race, creed, color, or ancestry; but he shall not have the right to a job if he does or does not belong to a union.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Where is there anything in the bill which says that a non-union man may be discriminated against?

Mr. TYDINGS. Absence speaks louder than words.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Where is it? The bill provides that no person shall be discriminated against. It does not say that no union person shall be discriminated against, or that no nonunion person shall be discriminated against. It says, "No person."

Mr. TYDINGS. Let the Senator support an amendment which will make that point clear by adding such a provision to the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When the Senate is ready to vote on the bill the Senator from New Mexico will answer the Senator's question, and he will answer it with just as much courage as is displayed by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, such discussion is unbecoming, and I am sorry that an impulse led me into the personal field in this matter. I apologize for an impulsiveness which is one of my great faults, and which I cannot always check. But I cannot help feeling that there is such transparent hypocrisy behind this whole proposal that it is not worthy of the thought or debate of the United States Senate, in the light of the circumstances which every man knows. There are Senators who will not vote for the right of a man to work irrespective of whether he belongs to a union, who are asking that he have the right to work no matter what his race, color, creed, or ancestry may be. Who is going to be fooled by such a position? I am sure that there would be some who would not agree with me; but if I were to talk to the colored people in any city in the United States and lay before them the facts as they have been presented on the floor of the Senate, I am sure that

their sense of humor—far greater than that of their compatriots of the white race—would be so tickled that they would see more quickly than a white audience the transparent sham of the whole proposal.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, notwithstanding all that has happened, I believe that this little controversy has brought about progress in the consideration of the bill.

Let me ask the Senator from Maryland if he has read the language on page 2 of the bill, defining unfair employment practices?

Mr. TYDINGS. What part of the bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. On page 2, line 13, where unfair employment practices are defined.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is the very thing about which I am speaking.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Section 3 provides, first, that—

It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer within the scope of this act—

(1) to refuse to hire any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

It does not say a union person, an organized-labor person, or any other kind of a person.

Proceeding further, we try to take care of unions, so that they will not discriminate. If the Senator will turn to page 3 of the bill, he will find the following language:

It shall be an unfair employment practice for any labor union within the scope of this act—

(1) to deny full membership rights and privileges to any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the bill does not go further and provide that it shall likewise be unfair for any employer to refuse to employ one who may or may not belong to a union.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What I am trying to impress upon my good friend the Senator from Maryland is this—

Mr. TYDINGS. Up to this moment, the Senator is not having very much success in impressing me. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know. But some people are so fallible that they simply will not be impressed.

At any rate, I will make a poor, humble attempt. This bill may not be the best bill in the world. It may be such as suggested by the Senator from Maryland. What I am complaining about is the denial by this body of the right to propose such an amendment as the one suggested by the Senator from Maryland or amendments such as the ones suggested by other Senators.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I voted to have the Senate take up the bill. The Senator has no quarrel with me. I am not filibustering; I am arguing the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand that. What I am complaining about is that both the Senator and I are taking up the time of the Senate on the bill, when we should be devoting that time in endeavoring to have the Senate act on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana

to incorporate in the Journal the prayer which was delivered on Thursday last, by the Chaplain and then we should try to get to the business of the Senate and possibly consider and approve the suggestion made by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I did not approach this argument as if I were trying a case in a court of law, with all the fine sidelights and nuances which might be employed to make one side of a case which is weak stand up, and another side of a case which is strong go down. I only tried, as I saw the matter, to bring out into the open what I consider to be a tremendous lack and, if I may say so without any intention of reflection, a tremendous and apparent lot of hypocrisy behind this whole thing, which causes me to believe that there are more political Ethiopians in this bill than there are working Ethiopians in it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has said that the bill goes beyond the hiring and firing of individuals. I know the Senator is well aware of the Western Electric strike and the troubles following it, which have nothing to do with the hiring and firing of workers.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish to sing a personal eulogy, but the debate has taken such range that I must digress for a moment. I hope that anyone who looks over my record here when I am gone will find that there has never been a vote by me, so far as I know, which has supported, directly or indirectly, any intolerance of any kind whatsoever. I was one of the first men in this body and in America openly to take a stand against prohibition. I fought it as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1922, when it was popular; I ran in a dry district on a wet platform. No one has ever questioned where I stood on that measure because I do not believe morals can be legislated by force into the people of America.

I fought the Ku Klux Klan in 1926, when I was a candidate for the Senate of the United States.

I fought the Wagner Labor Act because upon its face it condemns certain free-born, conscientious Americans to no opportunity to work unless they re-regulate their beliefs and economic religion to fit the concepts of their overseers.

I suppose there is no Member of this body who has more genuine regard for the colored man than I have. I was born and I have lived all my life in a community where they are quite numerous. I have represented many of them in court. They are a likable people. They have had a bad deal. In many respects they have not received the consideration to which they are entitled. My own immediate ancestors fought and died—and I mean died—in the Civil War, shot down in battle wearing the uniform of the Blue. My own great-great grandfather freed slaves in his will, in 1820. He did not have many; he had only three. But he provided that each one of them would be set free upon

his death, and he provided as best he could for their maintenance. I do not need to dwell on that.

I am just as anxious as is any other Member of this body to help the colored man in his long struggle to be accorded greater justice in the factory, in the office—anywhere. But as one who has some little regard for the lessons of history, I realize that Government cannot force such progress. It evolves. It has evolved. Almost within my lifetime—in fact, certainly within my lifetime—men in this country fought to set them free, to right a great wrong, to give them citizenship. They have made enormous strides since then. Some of them have turned out to be very eminent in the fields of endeavor they have selected. They are entitled to all the cooperation we can give them.

But I seriously doubt whether in the long run the whole idea of force, again, as was exhibited in connection with the Volstead Act, as was exhibited in connection with the Ku Klux Klan, as was exhibited in connection with the Wagner Act, and as is now exhibited here, is going to achieve the freedom and justice to which they are rightfully entitled.

There is only one way to guarantee to the colored man, if we are going to do it by law, the equal opportunity which the white man has in employment, and that is to wipe from his path every restriction which now keeps him back. It cannot be done by saying, "You can get a job in plant A only if you belong to a union." What good is it to take away discriminations because of race, color, religion, or ancestry, if, after that has been done, when a man goes to the door of a plant and knocks on it and says, "I want to work here"; the employer replies, "You cannot work here."

The man asks, "Why can't I work here? Do you mean that I can't work here because I am black?"

The employer says, "No; it is not that."

The man asks, "Do you mean that I can't work here because I am a Methodist—or a Catholic?"

The employer says, "No; it is not that."

The man asks, "Do you mean that I can't work here because my ancestors came from Africa?"

The employer says, "No; it is not that."

Then the man asks, "Then why can't I work here?"

The employer says, "You can't get a job here—I don't care what you believe—until you belong to XY Union. Unless you belong to XY Union, you get out of here, because there is no job here for you."

The man says, "But I am an American. Congress has said that you can't refuse to hire me because I am black."

The employer says, "That's right."

The man says, "You can't refuse to hire me because my ancestors lived some place else."

The employer says, "That's right."

The man says, "You can't refuse to hire me because I put on my questionnaire that I am a Methodist."

The employer says, "That's right."

Then the man says, "Well, if I am a free American and have done no wrong, why can't I get this job?"

The employer says, "Because the Congress of the United States in the Wagner Act says you can't work here unless you belong to the union."

Now where is this vaunted freedom? Where is all the freedom we were going to give the colored man? Despite all that we are now urged to do, he would be told by the employer, "No matter what your conscience or your ideals tell you, you have got to rearrange your ideals and your philosophy to suit those of the union; and, more than that, you have got to pay \$30 to a man who does not work here, who has nothing to do with my plant, for the opportunity to work here."

Now where is your equality?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. The silence here following the questions the Senator from Maryland has propounded in his speech is, I think, because the other Members of the Senate scarcely believe it is worth while to answer such arguments.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, Mr. President, I realize the limitations of the Senator from Idaho. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAYLOR. I appreciate that; I know that I am new and must suffer the consequences.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is not only new politically; he is new mentally.

Mr. TAYLOR. I hope I am new mentally; the world is in need of some new mental processes. However, I think that all this is just a left-handed attack against labor unions.

Mr. TYDINGS. I care not whether it is a left-handed, a right-handed, a front-handed, or a back-handed attack. The Senator, if he has any conscience—and I know he has—knows it is the truth; and the truth is the only thing that really matters.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is the truth that a man cannot work in some plants unless he is a member of the union.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. But that is a majority rule.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, pshaw!

Mr. TAYLOR. It is a rule by a majority of the union.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, if the majority of the people were to rule that the colored man should have no vote, no right to work, no chance to go to school, the Senator would say, "That is all right; the majority have ruled that the colored men shall have no vote, shall not have a right to work, shall not have a chance to go to school."

Mr. TAYLOR. I would vote against the proposition, but would still say that the majority decision rules in a democracy.

Mr. TYDINGS. Perhaps the Senator from Idaho would accept it, but I would go out and join the Army. When that day comes, I say it is time for all of us to join the Army.

Mr. TAYLOR. That day will not come.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, here is a government which was founded on the principle that there should not be taxation without representation. Here is a government which denies to a man the

fundamental right to make a living unless he is an economic Methodist, an economic Catholic, or an economic Jew. Religion is not alone of God. Religion is of this earth. Religion is not something abstract. It is not a concept that is up in the stars. Religion is nothing more than civilization, the invisible God by which men govern themselves without government, and conscience is the charter of religion. Conscience being the charter of religion, a man may in good conscience say, "I do not believe that labor unions are a good thing for America." But we say, "You must be a Methodist economist, or a Catholic economist, or a Jewish economist," while the Bill of Rights, in its first amendment, says that none of that shall be required in this country. Let me read it. We have heard much talk about the Bill of Rights, as if people would follow it as soon as its philosophy were put to the test. What does the Bill of Rights say? Amendment I begins as follows:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.

The majority may not declare this country to be Methodist. But if the majority so declared, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]—I do not know what his religion is—would immediately say, "That is all right. I have no mind on it. I have no ideals. I have no convictions. The majority has spoken. Henceforth we shall all be Methodists."

Or, if the Congress were to declare that our State religion shall be Catholic, or Jewish, and that no other religion shall be permitted, then the Senator from Idaho would say that the majority had spoken. He would say, "I really believe in Methodism, but the majority having spoken, I will immediately and conveniently believe in Catholicism if the majority believes in it, or in Judaism if the majority believes in it," and then the Senator would immediately become in favor of it.

Some persons have the idea that the philosophy of this amendment deals only with church affiliations. There are many atheists in this country. I do not agree with them, but they do not believe in God. There are many persons who do not go to church, but the Constitution gives them that freedom. Throughout the entire spirit and the very letter of the Bill of Rights the whole philosophy is that no man shall be denied work in America. But the Senator from Idaho would deny him work.

Mr. President, I am not attacking the unions. Perhaps if I were working in a place where a union existed I would join it. Persons have a right to belong to a union. I will defend that right here in the Senate with every ounce of strength I possess. Any man who wants to belong to a union has a right to belong to it, and every man who does not want to belong to a union should be protected by all the weight and power of this great Government. That is the only meaning of freedom that is worth anything at all. That is what the Bill of Rights provides. Let me again read from it:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

What was meant by religion was the whole field of human thought; the freedom to think and to believe, including the freedom to believe in a union or not to believe in it. Congress has said, in effect, "You must believe in a union or you may not work." That has stricken down the whole philosophy of the first amendment of the Bill of Rights.

Let us consider the subject of majorities. Who would follow a majority that would say that all men over 21 years of age shall be put to death? Who would follow a majority that would say that only those over 60 years of age shall be taxed? Who would follow a majority that would say that only those who belong to a labor union shall have the right to toil, earn, and rear a healthy and well-cared-for family? Yet, Mr. President, that is what the Congress of this country has said, and merely because there are 10,000,000 labor unionists who may have been misled in some way or another, we cannot get up the steam to undo the wrong which has been done.

I come from an industrial State. Baltimore has half the population of Maryland, and is a great industrial city. But I would rather leave this floor and stay off it from now until eternity than to be a party to prohibiting a man from obtaining a job merely because he did not belong to some union. I certainly would not be such a hypocrite as to think that by taking such a position I had aided the cause of freedom in the United States. There is no freedom in it. I am in favor of labor, but I do not want to play the game of the demagog by saying that labor is always right, because it is not always right any more than is capital always right. Our job is not to further the cause of labor or capital. Our job is to represent the entire public by seeing to it that no laws are passed here which are discriminatory against groups, be they religious groups, or otherwise.

Mr. President, I am not averse to the philosophy of the pending bill. I like its purpose. So far as it goes, I think it springs, in the main, from a conception of justice. My question is, Will it do the job? Can we enforce the results which are hoped for by the passage of such legislation?

I know that representatives of the colored people are in the gallery. My remarks will be referred to. I will be called an enemy of the colored race, a Fascist, and not fit to represent the great and free people of Maryland. I know that others will say, "There are Senators who are representing great interests, such as the steel interests, and so forth; they are the mouthpiece of big business." But I do not care what they may say. If I know, as I do know, that my position is straightforward and honest, and can be defended on the stump, I will meet them there if they want to draw the issue. I have felt that the people of Maryland, and of this country generally, whether they be black or white, will respond to truth and not succumb to misrepresentation.

Yes, Mr. President, we speak of liberals. Are you a liberal? If you are a liberal, knock the shackles off the working people of America and give them the right to earn bread without compelling

them to join any movement, religious or otherwise, as a prerequisite to obtaining work. That is the only real freedom that men may have. This proposal is but a convenient sham. It is not an ultimate approach to the situation, and in his inner heart and conscience every man knows that it will not afford complete freedom, as my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, was candid enough to admit by stating his own position.

I sympathize with the position of the Senator from Colorado. I think he is just as good a friend of the colored man as are the authors of the pending bill. Indeed, if the colored man were in any jeopardy or faced with any trouble, I believe the Senator from Colorado would stand here with all the force at his command in order to see that the colored man received a square deal. I am not interpreting his thoughts, but it is experiences which a Senator undergoes that perhaps chart his course here in considering the harm which may come to this race which has developed in this country, and which has already made great strides.

Mr. President, the hour of 6 o'clock having arrived, and all of us in this land now knowing of the intolerances of the Wagner Act which perhaps chained thousands of men, and now knowing that the pending bill does not stand for complete freedom but only for the political kind which will be handy in the next election, so far as I am concerned some one of those who are in charge of the bill may make a motion to recess, and we will retire for the night to more pleasant dreams.

RECESS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order that we may meditate over the sermon and chastisement of the Senator from Maryland, I move that the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 23, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 22, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, the ruler of the world's destiny, we pray Thee to lead us out of our misunderstandings into the light of Thy searching truth. As the devout spirit counts the beads of the rosary, so may we consider that our souls may bring forth from the living fields of faith works worthy of repentance. O Thou who art the Holy Spirit, open the secret of our hearts and may the divinity of our breasts seek Thee, in whom we live and move and have our being.

As we put the reins of our judgment in Thy hands, O Thou help the Congress to greet this day as a rich opportunity. We pray that social consciousness may be

tempered with the individual value of every man and woman, and that their personal worth may influence every mass movement in our country. O God, it is neither the reign of tyranny nor the rule of the mob that is Christian. Thy kingdom is neither meat nor drink, but righteousness, joy, and peace in Jesus our Elder Brother, after whom the whole family is named. O give us a mighty uprush of courage as we challenge any foe of free and democratic government, or any who fail to call Thee Lord and Master. In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS HELD BEFORE JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE PEARL HARBOR ATTACK

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1483) back favorably a privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 43), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of each part of the hearings held before said joint committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, a concurrent resolution to investigate the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and events and circumstances relating thereto.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY J. KAISER

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I think that history will support me in an expression of pride that a great American businessman, who has his headquarters in the district which I have the honor to represent, has taken a stand which I believe will lead our Nation out of the industrial crisis in which it is now involved. I refer to Henry J. Kaiser, of California, who led the whole world in production achievement during the recent war. It was his genius and the genius of other Americans like him which made victory for our armed forces possible.

This great western producer has set his face toward the future, while the eastern steelmasters are stubbornly looking backward. He recognizes that if the American Nation is to progress toward its ultimate destiny of full production

and full employment the average wage of American men and women who toil in industry must be established on a higher level than in the past.

Mr. Kaiser has pioneered the establishment of a steel industry on the Pacific coast. When the President of the United States declared that a higher wage for steel workers was essential for the economic welfare of this Nation, Henry Kaiser went promptly to the White House and announced his willingness to pay this wage to his employees. He put patriotism above profit, but I am convinced that this kind of patriotism will produce abundant profits in the future.

We of the West acclaim his action as a great patriotic contribution to the future welfare of the American people. We intend to back him to the limit.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

THE MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, after the message of the President on the state of the Union and transmitting the Budget for 1947 the American people need no longer have any doubts, if they had any, that the Truman administration is determined to put an end to free enterprise, competition, and liberty and complete the establishment of a totalitarian regime like that of Hitler and Stalin. Nor need the producing group, from manager to floorsweeper, longer have any doubts that the forces in control of our Government are irretrievably bent upon destroying everything that makes for their economic security and for their well-being.

This coming Thursday I shall, under special orders, discuss a few of the high points of the President's message. I intend to show that New Dealism, instead of being the great friend of the poor and the lower-income groups it so loudly proclaims to be, is indeed their worst conceivable enemy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a radio address made by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., on the subject of housing.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in three different instances—in the first to include a radio address delivered by him; in the second to include an interesting item appearing in a Lynn, Mass., newspaper; and a third, a letter from a constituent.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter from Mr. William A. Sykes, adjutant, twenty-seventh district, Brookville, Pa., and a resolution adopted on January 26 by the John Jacob Fisher Post, No. 62, American Legion.

REV. HEWLETT JOHNSON

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

A FEDERAL SYSTEM OF ARBITRATION NEEDED

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, returning from my congressional district in California, I find the great cry from the people is for something in the form of legislation to stop strikes. I feel that the strike situation has become so critical that this Congress should stay on the job night and day until labor and business are brought together and our people can go back to work.

Industrial enterprises employing thousands of workers and producing materials and providing services indispensable to the health and well-being of our Nation have been shut down by strikes. Yet, many other enterprises, equally important to our Nation, are threatened with shut-downs by additional strikes. No good can come from or make up for time lost in wages or loss in goods and services unproduced during strikes. The meat strike is depriving every individual in all walks of life of much needed meats and fats necessary for a balanced diet. Hogs are not being slaughtered; cattle are not being killed. Sheep, cattle, and hogs are backing up on the farms. Finished animals must continue to be fed at a loss to the farmer. Bakeries must close for the lack of sufficient fats in order to make bread and pastries.

Why could it not be for the benefit of all our people that our many enterprises continue to operate and its employees continue to produce during a period of controversy? We need a Federal system of arbitration which would provide peaceful settlement of all controversies between labor and management and business, assuring all facts relating to strikes and controversies.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that this order may be transferred to tomorrow, and that tomorrow I may address the House for 10 minutes following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from the Morning World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow Calendar Wednesday business may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I remind the gentleman from Alabama that last week I called attention to the President's message chiding Congress for not having bills ready for consideration or not considering the dozens of bills that are already on the calendar and have been there for a long time. What is the gentleman doing about that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose the gentleman knows that one reason for asking that Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with tomorrow is to enable us to take up a very important piece of legislation, the independent offices appropriation bill. Furthermore, bills are coming to the calendar and are being scheduled regularly; and we have a full day's work for tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if, in view of the fact that this morning seven Republicans voted with three Democratic members of the Labor Committee to bring out the President's fact-finding bill, there is any prospect of the Rules Committee giving us a rule so there may be a vote on this labor legislation for which the House has been clamoring so long.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman knows, of course, that I am not a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought maybe the gentleman knew something about what that committee may do.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not know that the committee had taken that action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in three instances and include three editorials which appeared in certain New York newspapers.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a comparison of figures taken from the home-town newspapers indicating the increasing rise in the cost of living.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Labor Committee this morning, seven Republicans voting with three Democrats, decided to report out the bill requested by the President, H. R. 4908, with amendments striking out the clause giving the power of subpoena and striking out section 4, which provided for a cooling-off period. If the Rules Committee will give us a rule making proposed legislation in order, the House will have an opportunity to consider the whole question of legislation designed to lessen labor disputes and strikes. I voted to report out the legislation solely for the purpose of affording the House an opportunity to act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

SALE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY TO VETERANS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of Congress to the manner in which the present authorities are handling surplus property. The veterans of my State of Florida do not get a chance to purchase this property.

At the last session of the Legislature of Florida there was created a State veterans' commission, which has recognized the fact that the veterans are given absolutely no chance to purchase property. The commission passed a resolution asking that the Congress take a hand in seeing that the veterans enjoy the privilege of purchasing this surplus property. For instance, in the city of Miami and the surrounding area they are taking surplus property and, instead of storing it in warehouses in the Miami area, are shipping the property to Atlanta, whereas provision could easily be made for the disposal of it down there, so the veterans could inspect and buy it.

The State veterans' commission has passed a resolution asking for an immediate investigation and for drastic action by the Congress. This is urgently demanded in order that the veterans may not be denied the right and privilege which the Congress intended the veterans to enjoy and which in countless cases is essential to the speedy

reestablishment of such veterans in civil life. I call upon the Congress for action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

ENLISTMENTS IN MILITARY FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, probably the hottest question before the country today is the demobilization issue. Close to it, is the subject of compulsory military training.

At no time that I can remember has the morale of our armed forces been more uncertain than it is at the present. The clamor from our boys who are in the Pacific and in Europe to come home is something to hear. I believe they have every right to be indignant over recent developments in the administration of the point system for discharges.

Fully as loud are the protests against universal conscription. These protests are being raised by a large part of our population and they will be heard even more loudly as the weeks go by. Yet all of us are agreed that some strong step must be taken to insure the preparedness to this great Nation even though we are now apparently at peace with the world.

As it now stands, one thing is certain; and that is, few seem to want to go into the armed services, and fewer seem to want to stay in.

That is because the average man in uniform feels he can better himself economically by getting back to civilian life. He looks forward to a well-paying job at home.

I believe that a strong Army and Navy are necessary to the defense of the United States. But I also believe that if the country retains this strength, it will have to pay for it. Today millions of our best manhood are leaving the service, obtaining civilian jobs at better pay, shorter hours and greater opportunity.

I say it is time to make the services more attractive in order to keep our best manhood in them. It is just as necessary to have highly efficient, ambitious, intelligent personnel in our fighting force as it is in other Government departments and in private employment. In wartime this is easy to attain, but impossible in peace under the set-up as it now exists.

The solution, then, is to make possible a career in the Army or Navy for every man who wants to stay there. How can this be done? By paying more money to enlisted men, assuring them of advancement through merit, of retirement and reasonable working hours.

Because I am concerned with the present low state of morale in our armed forces, because I believe that a great deal of this is due to the fact that so many men are being kept there at low pay and in remote places while many folks back home are gainfully employed, because I believe the very future of America de-

pends upon the peacetime maintenance of strength of our Army and Navy, I am today introducing a bill to raise the base pay of all enlisted members of our armed services from \$50 to \$100 a month and am recommending that all seven grades of enlisted personnel be raised relatively.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEALY (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances; to include in one a letter written to President Truman by Mr. Dezauche, publisher and editor of the Sweet Sheet, Opelousas, La., and in the other an open letter to the Members of Congress from the people of Flint, Mich.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article by the president of the Lumbermen's Retail Association.

Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend her remarks in the Record.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, and include in each an editorial.

RESCIND CARRY-BACKS

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SAVAGE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am glad my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has brought to the attention of the House the fact that the Committee on Labor has reported out this morning a bill which not only do I consider meaningless but it also takes out section 11 of the National Labor Relations Act. So I am telling the Members of the House that

a bill will come in here in the next few days and you will have nothing but a meaningless bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wonder, if the Committee on Rules should see fit to grant a liberal rule, if the bill that has been reported might be used as a vehicle for getting real legislation, and is the gentleman in favor of that?

Mr. LESINSKI. That all depends on the amendments and the type of amendments.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Leo Wolman appearing in the Washington Post of December 20.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

FORMULA FOR SETTling LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from one of my constituents, a part of which I should like to read. He said:

My union also presented the Southern California Gas Co. with a request for a 30-percent wage increase, and after meeting and discussing the proposition with them they offered a 15-percent increase and the rest to be carried on by negotiations or by the Department of Labor Conciliation Service, or board of arbitration, or a panel, which would go into the thing quite thoroughly, and whatever decision was made would be binding on both parties.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, every one of these controversies could have been settled by the application of some such simple formula as that had there been a real will to do so.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], my personal friend, asked the question of the gentleman from Michigan that if the Committee on Rules took it upon themselves to use as a medium the bill reported by the Committee on Labor and reported a liberal rule, making certain amendments in order, how would the gentleman from Michigan feel about it? I am going to tell how I feel about it. I think that the Rules Committee should not bring in a rule other than to make amendments that are germane in order.

I know the Rules Committee has the power to report a rule for the consideration of the bill that was agreed upon by the Labor Committee this morning, and I have no objection to that, but if the Rules Committee is going to provide in that rule that an amendment containing language embodied in a bill pending before some other committee of the House shall be considered to be in order, then not the legislation but the rule is going to be the issue when that rule is before the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, the gentleman wants an open rule, a rule which makes in order all germane amendments, and he does not want any special rule from the Rules Committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. My viewpoint is, if you bring in a rule making the bill in order and permitting germane amendments to be considered, I am satisfied, but if your committee provides in that rule that the language in a certain bill pending before the Military Affairs Committee or some other committee shall be not subject to a point of order, then I am against such a rule.

THE FACT-FINDING BILL

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address my colleagues for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as acting chairman of the Committee on Labor, I addressed you on Thursday of last week and said that on Monday or Tuesday of this week your committee would take definite action in reference to H. R. 4908, the so-called fact-finding bill, embodying the requests of the President of the United States.

Your committee this morning, and by a vote of 10 to 8, has reported the bill amended in essence to delete both the subpoena provision and the 30-day cooling period. It was my personal feeling that H. R. 4908 should have been reported as requested by the President of the United States. I was one of the five members of our group who voted to report such a measure. The committee saw fit to do otherwise and has reported, as I have stated, this amended measure.

It was my feeling then, and is my feeling now, that the principle of fact finding should be considered as proper subject matter and the responsibility of Congress. I believe that the committee,

in reporting legislation, now presents the opportunity and the responsibility to the House of Representatives to work its will, individually and collectively, on a highly important subject to the well-being of our people and the welfare of the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

A FEDERAL COMMISSION FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish a Federal commission for the physically handicapped. This bill has been drawn up after long study by a special committee of this House headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] and has been prepared by the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped. The bill may not be perfect, I do not say it is, but I do think it is something to enable us to start work on this very serious problem and I am introducing the bill for the consideration of the proper committee of the House.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, may I compliment him on his action. I think he has done a splendid thing in introducing this bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the gentleman. I think one fact that the American people overlook is that there are 25,000,000 physically handicapped persons among us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a brief statement on the bill providing a Federal commission for the physically handicapped and to include the provisions of the bill.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and in two instances and include first, a letter from a constituent, and, secondly, a statement by a former colleague.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts and an editorial.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE AND LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] charged that the President's message recommends the destruction of free en-

terprise. I fear the gentleman did not hear the message read, nor has he read the message himself. Had he done so, he never would have dared make such a charge. The President's message is one of the most courageous, enlightened, and constructive messages that has ever been sent to this House.

What do the gentlemen mean by free enterprise?

Do they mean freedom to refuse to bargain collectively as required by the National Labor Relations Act, as has been done by General Electric and Westinghouse?

Do they mean freedom to cancel union contracts, as General Electric and Westinghouse did their contracts with United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO, to precipitate the strike which began last Tuesday?

Do they mean freedom to refuse to sit down at the conference table and discuss labor contracts? I have just spoken of the strike against General Electric and Westinghouse. Do the gentlemen know that Westinghouse has never made a counterproposal to the union's demands, but has simply refused to discuss wages? The only counterproposal made by General Electric involved small wage increases conditioned on increased production per worker, which means our old demon, the speed-up, and reduction of incentive wages.

Again, what do the gentlemen mean by "free enterprise"? Do they mean the freedom of United States Steel to refuse imperiously the request of the President of the United States? Whose freedom are they talking about?

Mr. Speaker, I have heard much of free enterprise in this Chamber. I have sat here a long time. When I was still a young man, but older in the service of this my adopted country than some of my colleagues who have been moaning here today the destruction of free enterprise, this Congress passed the Clayton Act, to strengthen and reinforce the Sherman Antitrust Act. Those laws were to insure the existence of free enterprise by restraining monopoly. Those laws were designed to save free enterprise by keeping the industrial and financial giants from swallowing their little competitors without giving small business even a chance to struggle. Would the gentleman repeal these laws?

The fight never ends. Apologists for big business rush daily to the well of this House; yet there is scarcely a big business today against which there is not some complaint of unfair business practice. A whole division of the Department of Justice exists, by will of Congress, to save free enterprise by restraining monopoly.

Does free enterprise mean the unrestricted right of big business to ride roughshod over the people? No. We hear much of General Motors and General Electric. What about the general public? While the gentlemen weep for U. S. Steel, let us think a little of U. S. us. It is not free enterprise when the General Electric Co. and Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Corp. enter into patent agreements, into marketing agreements, into production quota agreements, and control absolutely and with-

out recourse the amount of electrical appliances that can be made and sold in the United States. Those are the practices that destroy free enterprise. Our anti-trust laws were made to keep free enterprise alive, and President Truman's message was a clarion call to this Congress to continue to keep free enterprise alive.

A RULE FOR THE FACT-FINDING BILL

As to the so-called fact-finding bill, and the rule under which we shall debate it, I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that it should be an open rule, and not waiving any points of order, so as to preclude any foreign matters.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] stated that six Republicans and three Democrats voted to report this bill, which made me suspicious in what form the bill was reported. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] explained to the House that the bill has been so emasculated that really it will be of no value to the President to bring about legislation that will eliminate the discord between industry and the labor unions that industry is trying to destroy.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that when the bill will be considered on the floor progressives and the well-intended Democrats will amend it in such a way that the existing forced labor strikes, now going on, may be eliminated by removing the causes of friction, and so that these huge Wall Street-controlled industries will not feel they are greater and more powerful than government itself.

THE STRIKES AND THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the American people are not deceived by this wave of strikes and other attacks on free enterprise that have for their object forcing the Government to take over the manufacturing industries of America. I think it not inappropriate to rise at this time and say a few words in behalf of the forgotten man—the American farmer.

It has been agreed by all who understand it that the cotton farmer gets 1 cent an hour for his work for every cent a pound he receives for his lint cotton.

The 15-cent raise offered to workers in the steel plants would give them \$1.29 an hour, on the average. The average steel worker is not any more intelligent than the average cotton farmer, or any more industrious. He works in the shade, sometimes sitting down, while the cotton farmer is plowing, hoeing, or picking cotton in the hot sun. If the cotton farmer received the same pay for his work—\$1.29 an hour—cotton would be selling at \$1.29 a pound.

If the wheat grower got the same amount for his work, in proportion, wheat would be between \$5 and \$7 a bushel.

If the corn farmer received the same amount in proportion for his work, the same price in proportion for his corn,

corn would be \$4 or \$5 a bushel; hogs would be 50 to 60 cents a pound; and beef cattle would be bringing the same price.

Do not forget that this is an agricultural country, and it can never be controlled by a communistic set-up. Our form of government and our way of life are here to stay. This is America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

A FIERCE AND AWFUL TIME

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it may surprise some of my colleagues, but I do attend church quite regularly. However, it is not my purpose to advertise it, but to call attention to a hymn we sang from the Presbyterian hymnal last Sunday. This hymn was written in 1865. As I recall, the words of the first verse are as follows:

We are living, we are dwelling
In a fierce and awful time
In an age on ages telling
To be living is sublime.

I wonder what the author of this great hymn would say if he were living today. No doubt back in 1865 he felt that his day of warfare and trouble was quite awful. If he were living today it would be interesting to see what kind of a hymn he would write.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion this morning as to what the Rules Committee will do in the way of a rule for the consideration of labor matters. We are grateful for the advice of Members at any time about any subject. As a member of the Rules Committee, I can speak only for myself as to what type of rule the Rules Committee will grant. I think the American people are tired of seeing Congress shadow-box with the labor situation. I, for one, do not propose to advocate any rule or any bill that has no other purpose than to deceive the American people into thinking we are doing something about the labor situation when we know we are not.

The bill which has been reported, as I understand it, has removed all semblance of teeth from it, and remains but a title, plus a few kind words. Personally, I shall not be in favor of a rule on any such measure and shall use my best efforts to get a rule that will permit this House, or the Members of the House who wish to do something about the situation, to vote on any strike legislation that they

desire. I favor legislation that will definitely put an end to labor-union dictatorship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has advocated what he believes to be an open rule respecting the anti-labor bill reported out by the Committee on Labor this morning. The gentleman from Virginia has not always advocated open rules. We can always judge the character of the rule the gentleman advocates by the type of labor bill on which a rule is being granted. Our memory is not so short that we have forgotten the kind of rule which was granted on the so-called Smith-Arends bill, a rule making in order what was out of order. Further, let this House beware of a similar rule for this bill which may be reported out by the Rules Committee under the guise of a so-called open rule. In other words, the gentleman from Virginia adjusts the rules to suit the purpose—one purpose, and one purpose alone, to carry out his anti-labor schemes in the Congress of the United States.

The gentleman from Virginia made a very revealing remark last Thursday in reply to a question that I asked him. He referred to labor as a commodity. He said:

The decision of the fact-finding board is that General Motors should pay so much money. I guess I am a little bit old-fashioned, but I was raised up in this country and my ancestors were, and we always went out and we bargained for what we wished to purchase. If the price suited us, we dealt; if not, we did not. If we thought a thing was worth so much, we were willing to pay so much for it. If we thought it was not worth so much we were not willing to pay for it.

How revealing of utter contempt and disdain for the men and women who toil.

It just so happens that the days have gone far past in the United States when labor was considered a commodity. Workers are human beings contributing to the wealth and welfare of America and are entitled as a matter of right to a decent living. They have earned the right to organize and to strike to obtain it. They are not mere commodities to be purchased at a sale and at a price that General Motors, United States Steel, or the gentleman from Virginia are willing to pay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—TRANSMITTING A REPORT FROM THE ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE REGARDING CERTAIN PHASES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and together with the accom-

panying papers referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Acting Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, in connection with the foreign service retirement and disability system as required by section 26 (a) of an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the foreign service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, approved February 23, 1931, as amended.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

January 22, 1946.

[Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, foreign service.]

JANUARY 21, 1946.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House.

The PRESIDENT: The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President a report, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, in connection with the foreign service retirement and disability system, as required by section 26 (a) of an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the foreign service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, approved February 23, 1931, as amended. Respectfully submitted,

DEAN ACHESON,

Acting Secretary of State.

[Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, foreign service.]

Foreign service retirement and disability fund—Statement of receipts and disbursements, fiscal year 1945

RECEIPTS

Federal contributions.....	\$910,500.00
Contributions	210,827.26
Voluntary contributions.....	27,115.46
Interest on investments.....	308,706.30
Interest on investments, voluntary contributions.....	16.27
Total receipts.....	1,457,165.29

DISBURSEMENTS

Annuities (number of persons, 188)	524,655.15
Refunds	12,453.67
Cost of additional investments less value of investments redeemed	824,000.00
Total disbursements.....	1,361,108.82
Balance in fund exclusive of investments, June 30, 1945.....	114,213.59
Face value of investments, June 30, 1945.....	114,213.59

RECAPITULATION, FISCAL YEARS 1925 TO 1945, INCLUSIVE

Receipts:	
Federal contributions.....	\$6,283,100.00
Contributions	4,264,317.26
Voluntary contributions.....	124,979.26
Interest on investments.....	2,408,502.87
Interest on investments, voluntary contributions	16.27
Miscellaneous	931.85
Total receipts.....	13,086,847.51

RECAPITULATION, FISCAL YEARS 1925 TO 1945, INCLUSIVE—continued

Disbursements:	
Annuities	\$4,616,498.20
Refunds	518,736.20
Miscellaneous	1,399.52
Cost of additional investments less value of investments redeemed.....	7,836,000.00
Total disbursements.....	12,972,633.92
Balance in fund exclusive of investments, June 30, 1945	114,213.59
Face value of investments, June 30, 1945	7,836,000.00

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. HENDRICKS, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5201) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1484), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH reserved all points of order on the bill.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the Consent Calendar.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 320) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (57 Stat. 306).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. KEAN, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected.

RETIREMENT PRIVILEGE EXTENDED TO CERTAIN DISTRICT COURT JUDGES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 565) to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. KEAN, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected.

ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN TORT CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 181) to provide for the adjustment of certain tort claims against the United States and to confer jurisdiction in respect thereto on the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. KEAN, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected.

TO PRESERVE THE NATIONALITY OF NATURALIZED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4605) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill ought not to become law. Under the circumstances, with the author of the bill, Mr. Dickstein, having retired from the Congress, and the bill carrying some very far-reaching implications affecting our immigration laws.

I am not in favor of helping break down our immigration laws. Therefore, I object to its consideration, with the hope that the next time the bill is called up two other gentlemen will join with me and strike it from the calendar.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. RANKIN. I think we had better go ahead with the calendar.

PLACING CHINESE WIVES OF AMERICAN CITIZENS ON A NONQUOTA BASIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4844) to provide for the admission to the United States of the alien Chinese wives of American citizens who are admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those authorizing exclusion on grounds of race or birth in a defined geographical area.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECTS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 265) to provide for proceeding with certain river and harbor projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DOMESTIC RAISING OF FUR-BEARING ANIMALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2115) relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, at the request of the President the Congress passed one of his "must" bills, the so-called reorganization bill. For the past 18 years I have been a member of every committee that has considered a reorganization

bill and I contend that the President now has the best law that any President ever had to reorganize the executive branch of the Government.

There are about eight different agencies of Government engaged in fish and wildlife activities, everyone of which should be placed under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Here is a bill which if passed by the Congress takes away certain activities from the Wildlife Service and places jurisdiction in the Department of Agriculture; the Wildlife Service is in the Department of the Interior, therefore, I think we should wait and see what the President does in his reorganization plan. The Congress should not pass bills of this character now, because, if we did it would be practically saying to the President "Leave this activity where we put it."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think that raising animals is an agricultural pursuit?

Mr. COCHRAN. I think that the Fish and Wildlife Service has been handling the matter satisfactorily.

Mr. RANKIN. This does not pertain to wildlife. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that I have seen some of these fur farms in Alaska. The average fox farm is not any larger than this room. The animals are merely kept there because of the cold climate. Their hereditary instincts cause them to grow thick, very heavy fur, which cannot be produced in other sections of the country. So these small fox farms are being run in connection with small homes, where they are trying to carry on agricultural and other pursuits. So far as I am concerned I think it is the business of the Department of Agriculture and not the business of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that at one time we took a lot of these activities away from the Department of Agriculture, including wildlife, and I do not want them to go back there now unless the President puts the Fish and Wildlife Service under Agriculture. I do not care where the Fish and Wildlife Service is put but certainly all such activities should be under one head.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The purpose of this bill is simply to draw a line between wildlife, on the one hand, and domestic agriculture on the other. It does not take from the Fish and Wildlife Service anything pertaining to wildlife at all.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have read the bill, I have read the report, and I read the gentleman's remarks when the bill was up for consideration a few days ago.

Mr. RANKIN. It leaves wildlife just as it is now.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS AND DISTRICT COURTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4230) to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE CLASSIFIED EXECUTIVE CIVIL SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 102) to amend section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to provide for counting military service of certain employees of the legislative branch in determining the eligibility of such employees for civil-service status under such act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, request was sought and granted the last time the Consent Calendar was called that the bill be passed over without prejudice for the reason that the report did not comply with the rules of the House. Apparently a corrected report has not yet been filed. I therefore make the same request and ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE HATCH ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1118) to amend the Hatch Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the author of the bill to give us an explanation?

Mr. HOBBS. The author of the Hatch Act is in favor of this legislation, as is every one else who knows the facts, I think, and I am delighted to respond to the gentleman's reservation of objection. The whole situation grows out of a condition that obtains, for instance, in Philadelphia, where a postal employee, who had served 30 years, at the request of a fellow employee who wanted to run for office, circulated a petition and got the requisite number of signatures for him to announce his candidacy. That is the only offense that he has been guilty of. But under the law the Civil Service Commission says that they have no discretion, so they had to fire this man. He lost his seniority rights. He lost his retirement rights, and so on. It was that and four similar cases that

caused our committee to hold full hearings on this matter. The bill has the approval of the Civil Service Commission that administers the act, of the author of the act, and every one else who is in sympathy with the act. The only objection that has been made is from those who say that it does not go far enough; that we ought to repeal the act. But we know that this bill should be passed as a modicum of simple justice. All we are trying to do is to give the Civil Service Commission in the administration of the act the option where the penalty is entirely too severe; to give them the right to reduce that horrible penalty to a fine of some 90 days' pay.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman that the justice and equity of this bill appeals to everyone who is familiar with it. However, there is one clause in the bill as contained in the committee amendment which I do not approve, and that is, it provides for a fine of 3 months' compensation. After discussing this matter with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission I propose to offer this amendment which I think should carry, and insert in lieu of that language "90 days suspension from duties without compensation." That gives the Civil Service Commission a right to issue anything from a reprimand up to a 90-day suspension, whereas heretofore, even for the slightest violation of the Hatch Act, it does not make any difference how good the man's standing might be or how long he had worked, they would just kick him out, and usually by a vote of 2 to 1 of the Commissioners.

It just gives to the Commission the right to issue anything from a reprimand up to a 90-day suspension. I think that discretion certainly should be in there in the interest of justice and fair play.

Mr. HOBBS. I was just going on to say that an amendment is to be offered by the committee which I understand has the approval of both sides. We have no objection to that, that is, those members of the committee with whom I have consulted.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Under my reservation I simply wanted to obtain information, I was not opposed to the bill. In view of the information received, I am personally in favor of the bill.

Mr. HOBBS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that the Civil Service Commission fired a postal employee?

Mr. HOBBS. The Civil Service Commission is administering the Hatch Act. Under that it conceives it to be its duty—and I think all authorities agree with it, and I am sure the gentleman would—that is has no discretion but to fire them.

Mr. GRANGER. Then the act should be repealed, in my opinion; the whole business should be repealed.

Mr. HOBBS. We wish to do justice before we can wait for that.

Mr. BARDEN. This removes part of the brutality.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am rather in sympathy with the suggestion made by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] that the bill should be taken up under the regular rules of the House, under a rule that would give us the right to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert a provision just repealing the Hatch Act. The PAC, that illegal communistic outfit, has its ramifications in every department of this Government, and its agents go around and try to dictate to the American people how they shall vote and spread every kind of smear and lie about Members of Congress and other candidates.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, in view of this "smear" of labor I demand the regular order.

Mr. RANKIN. I have no objection to the bill. My remarks were no "smear" of labor, but I was pointing out the latitude taken by the PAC racketeers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. KEAN objected.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3243) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122-1124), is hereby amended as follows:

(A) By changing the colon preceding the proviso in section 3 to a period, by striking out the proviso in section 3, and by inserting in lieu thereof the following language:

"The Archivist shall impose such restrictions on the use or examination of records in his custody as appear to him to be necessary or desirable in the public interest: *Provided*, That whenever the head of any agency shall specify in writing restrictions on the use or examination of records being considered for transfer from his custody to that of the Archivist that appear to him to be necessary or desirable in the public interest, the Archivist shall impose such restrictions on such of the records as are transferred to his custody; and restrictions so imposed shall not be removed or relaxed by the Archivist without the concurrence in writing of the head of the agency from which the material shall have been transferred unless the existence of that agency shall have been terminated: *And provided further*, That restrictions on the use or examination of records in the custody of the Archivist heretofore imposed and now in force and effect under the terms of section 3 of the National Archives Act, approved June 19, 1934, shall continue in force and effect regardless of the expiration of the tenure of office of the official who imposed them but may be removed or relaxed by the Archivist with the concurrence in writing of the head of the

agency from which the material has been transferred or by the Archivist alone if the existence of that agency shall have been terminated."

(B) By inserting after section 6 a new section as follows:

"Sec. 6a. Whenever any records the use of which is subject to statutory limitations and restrictions are transferred to the custody of the Archivist of the United States, permissive and restrictive statutory provisions with respect to the examination and use of such records applicable to the head of the agency having custody of them or to employees of that agency shall thereafter likewise be applicable to the Archivist of the United States and to the employees of the National Archives Establishment respectively."

(C) By inserting after section 8 a new section as follows:

"Sec. 8a. Any official of the United States Government who is authorized to make certifications or determinations on the basis of records in his custody is hereby authorized to make certifications or determinations on the basis of records that have been transferred by him or his predecessors to the custody of the Archivist of the United States."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE RETIRED LIST OF THE REGULAR NAVY AND COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 473) relating to pay and allowances of officers of the retired list of the Regular Navy and Coast Guard performing active duty in the rank of rear admiral.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each officer of the retired list of the Regular Navy or Regular Coast Guard recalled to active duty in the rank of rear admiral, now or hereafter performing active duty in such rank, shall be paired with an officer of the active list in the manner hereinafter prescribed, when such duty is, or any other prior active duty in such rank performed after recall to active duty, shall have been performed outside the United States in time of war or national emergency. If the officer with whom such retired officer is so paired is, or shall become, entitled to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the upper half other than solely by virtue of the duty to which assigned, such retired officer shall likewise be entitled to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the upper half whenever performing active duty after (a) the date of this act or (b) the date he became eligible for pairing or (c) the date the officer with whom he is paired becomes entitled to such pay and allowances, whichever date is latest. Any retired officer after becoming entitled to such pay and allowances shall thereafter be entitled to retired pay when not in an active-duty status, equal to 75 percent of such active-duty pay.

Sec. 2. The officer with whom the retired officer is paired under section 1 hereof shall be a line officer of the Regular Navy or Regular Coast Guard, as the case may be, of the rank of rear admiral, other than an officer who holds such rank solely by virtue of the duty to which assigned, and shall be the officer whose date of rank is nearest to the date such retired officer would have commenced active service in such rank if all his active service therein, including any such service prior to retirement, had been performed continuously in the period immediately preceding the date of such pairing.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That any officer of the retired list of the Navy or Coast Guard of the permanent grade or rank of rear admiral who is entitled to the pay of the lower half of that grade and who is, has been, or may be recalled to active duty and who in time of war or other national emergency served, serves, or may serve satisfactorily on active duty for a period of 2 years or more in the grade or rank of rear admiral or in a higher grade, shall be entitled when on active duty to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the upper half unless he is entitled under other provisions of law to higher pay and allowances, and he shall be entitled when on inactive duty to retired pay equal to 75 percent of the pay of a rear admiral of the upper half unless he is entitled under other provisions of law to higher retired pay or allowances: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued under this act prior to the date of its approval."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL RURAL REHABILITATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2501) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of and ultimately liquidate Federal rural rehabilitation projects, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

ALASKA REVENUE BONDS FOR PUBLIC WORKS PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3580) to authorize municipalities and public-utility districts in the Territory of Alaska to issue revenue bonds for public-works purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That municipal corporations and public utility districts in the Territory of Alaska, acting by and through their governing bodies, are hereby authorized without other authority than is herein contained to construct, reconstruct, improve, extend, better, repair, equip, or acquire public works of permanent character which may be operated upon a revenue-producing basis, and, upon majority vote of the qualified voters in such municipal corporation or public utility district, to issue bonds for such purposes payable solely from unpledged revenue of the public works for which such bonds are issued, including future additions and improvements. Such public works shall include but not be limited to water facilities, sewers and sewage-disposal facilities, heating plants and distribution facilities, gas plants and distribution facilities, electric power and light plants, and distribution facilities.

Sec. 2. Bonds issued under this act shall bear such date or dates, may be in such denominations, may mature in such amounts and at such time or times, may be payable at such place or places, may be sold at either public or private sale, may be redeemable (either with or without premium) or non-redeemable, may carry such registration privileges, and may be executed by such officers and in such manner as shall be prescribed by the governing body. In case any

of the officers whose signatures appear on the bonds or coupons shall cease to be such officers before delivery of such bonds, such signatures, whether manual or facsimile shall, nevertheless, be valid and sufficient for all purposes, the same as if such officers had remained in office until such delivery. The bonds so issued shall bear interest at a rate to be fixed by the governing body, not to exceed, however, 6 percent per annum, payable annually or semiannually, and shall be sold for not less than the principal amount thereof plus accrued interest.

Sec. 3. Bonds issued hereunder or the proceedings of the governing body authorizing their issuance may contain such covenants as the governing body deems advisable concerning the rates or fees to be charged for services rendered by the public works, the revenue of which is pledged to the payment of such bonds; the deposit and use of the revenue of such public works; the issuance of additional bonds payable from revenue of such public works; and the rights of the bondholders in case of default in the payment of the principal or of interest on the bonds, including the appointment of a receiver to operate such public works.

Sec. 4. All acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are repealed to the extent of such conflict. The powers conferred herein shall be in addition and supplemental to and the limitations imposed hereby shall not affect the powers conferred by any other law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVENUE BONDS, HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3614) to ratify and confirm Act 33 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1945, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, revised laws of Hawaii, 1945.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Act 33 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1945, amending chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, so as to extend the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under said chapter 118, is hereby ratified and confirmed and revenue bonds may be issued under and pursuant to the provisions of said chapter 118 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, as amended by said Act 33, without the approval of the President of the United States and without the incurring of an indebtedness within the meaning of the Hawaiian Organic Act, and said chapter 118, as amended, shall constitute full authority for the issuance of said bonds without reference to and independent of the Hawaiian Organic Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RATIFYING AND CONFIRMING ACT 32 OF THE SESSION LAWS OF HAWAII, 1945

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3657) to ratify and confirm Act 32 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1945.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Act 32 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1945, amending Act 101 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1921, relating to the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the districts of North and South Hilo and Puna, in the county of Hawaii, by extending the franchise

to the districts of Kau and South Kohala, in that county, is hereby ratified and confirmed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4932) to amend section 9 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the author of the bill would consider an amendment to the Boulder Canyon Project Act to restore the original name of the project in honor of Herbert Hoover?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman, I feel that the proposal is not germane to this particular bill, and I would have to oppose it. However, I am not opposed to the idea in general of naming certain public works after appropriate individuals, as I have a feeling that the great dams and works of that sort in the West ought to be named after prominent public officials who have had most to do with their construction. But this is simply a bill which extends the benefits of the act to the veterans of the Second World War exactly as the original act extended those benefits to the veterans of the First World War, and applies those benefits to lands in Arizona as well as to lands in California. I am quite anxious that the bill be passed, and I believe that the proposed amendment might interfere with or at least delay passage of the legislation. This bill is needed to couple with H. R. 2742 which passed the House by unanimous consent some months ago.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in order that we may go into that a little bit further and that I may have an opportunity to confer with the gentleman from Arizona, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. MURDOCK. I hope the gentleman will not delay the passage of the bill, as it would delay important benefits to qualified veterans.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The bill would not be delayed very long, but merely until the next time the Consent Calendar is called and we have had an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman wants to take up the general matter of legislation such as he proposed, I am quite willing to take that up at any time aside from this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will not object because this particular matter involves only an amendment to section 9. The House has already passed the bill giving veterans of this war the same privileges

as veterans of other wars with reference to preference under the Boulder Canyon Act. However, in exploring that situation, it was discovered that the original act only gave preference to those lands on the Nevada and California side and not on the Arizona side. This particular bill is to extend the benefits to those lands on the Arizona side. The other bill is before the Senate. When this bill goes to the other body it can all be worked in and the Arizona lands can be granted the same privileges that have been granted to the Nevada and California lands.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's argument. I certainly have no objections to the purposes of the bill. I should be in favor of its passage, but I see no particular harm in giving us an opportunity to go into the other matter. The bill will only be postponed until the first Monday in February at which time I would have no objection to the consideration of passage of the bill if we can in the meantime come to some agreement on the other matter.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, may I say in addition to what the gentleman from Florida has said that the other bill is pending in the Senate and we would like very much to pass this legislation so as to dovetail it into the other legislation. The proposal would certainly not be appropriate to this measure.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Arizona is chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. Would the gentleman assure me of early consideration of a bill if I offer a separate bill on the subject of renaming the project according to its original name in recognition of Mr. Hoover's efforts in its original construction?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I will undertake as chairman of the committee to make that promise to my friend for I am always glad to consider any legislation offered by my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057, 1063, 43 U. S. C., sec. 617h) is amended to read as follows:

"All lands of the United States found by the Secretary of the Interior to be practicable of irrigation and reclamation by the irrigation works authorized herein shall be withdrawn from public entry. Thereafter, at the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, such lands shall be opened for entry, in tracts varying in size but not exceeding 160 acres, as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, in accordance with the provisions of the reclamation law, and any such entryman shall pay an equitable share in accordance with the benefits received, as determined by the said Secretary, of the construction cost of said canal and appurtenant structures; said payments to be made in such installments and at such times as may be specified by the Secretary of the Interior, in accordance with the provisions

of the said reclamation law, and shall constitute revenue from said project and be covered into the fund herein provided for: *Provided*, That all persons who served in the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard during World War II, the War with Germany, the War with Spain, or in the suppression of the insurrection in the Philippines, and who have been honorably separated or discharged therefrom or placed in the Regular Army or Naval Reserve, shall have the exclusive preference right for a period of 3 months to enter said lands, subject, however, to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 672, 702, 43 U. S. C., sec. 433); and also, so far as practicable, preference shall be given to said persons in all construction work authorized by this chapter: *Provided further*, That the above exclusive preference rights shall apply to veteran settlers on lands watered from the Gila canal in Arizona the same as to veteran settlers on lands watered from the All-American canal in California: *Provided further*, That in the event such an entry shall be relinquished at any time prior to actual residence upon the land by the entryman for not less than 1 year, lands so relinquished shall not be subject to entry for a period of 60 days after the filing and notation of the relinquishment in the local land office, and after the expiration of said 60-day period such lands shall be open to entry, subject to the preference in this section provided."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5135) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law No. 118, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended by Public Law No. 276, Seventy-eighth Congress, is amended by striking out all of the first sentence therein following the words "marketing years 1944-45, 1945-46" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "1946-47 and 1947-48 shall be proclaimed and the national marketing quota proclaimed by the Secretary and the State and farm acreage allotments established pursuant to the proclaimed national quota for burley tobacco for the 1946-47 marketing year shall be reduced uniformly so as to make available a supply of burley tobacco for such marketing year not less than the reserve supply level: *Provided*, That no allotment of 1 acre or less shall be reduced by more than 10 percent."

The amendment made by this section shall not apply to flue-cured tobacco for the 1946-47 marketing year.

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 314 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The marketing of any kind of tobacco in excess of the marketing quota for the farm on which the tobacco is produced shall be subject to a penalty of 50 percent of the average market price (calculated to the nearest whole cent) for such kind of tobacco for the immediately preceding marketing year."

The amendment made by this section shall become effective July 1, 1946.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLANNAGAN: On page 2, lines 9 to 18, inclusive, after line 8, strike out:

"Sec. 2. The first sentence of section 314 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'The marketing of any kind of tobacco in excess of the marketing quota for the farm on which the tobacco is produced shall be subject to a penalty of 50 percent of the average market price (calculated to the nearest whole cent) for such kind of tobacco for the immediately preceding marketing year.'

"The amendment made by this section shall become effective July 1, 1946."

And insert:

"Sec. 2. The first sentence of section 314 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'The marketing of any kind of tobacco in excess of the marketing quota for the farm on which the tobacco is produced shall be subject to a penalty of 40 percent of the average market price (calculated to the nearest whole cent) for such kind of tobacco for the immediately preceding marketing year.'

"The amendment made by this section shall become effective July 1, 1946, except that in the case of flue-cured tobacco such amendment shall become effective May 1, 1947."

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I may state that this legislation amends the tobacco law by giving the Secretary of Agriculture the right to decrease burley tobacco allotments for this year, and by increasing the penalty on tobacco grown on acreage in excess of allotments from 10 cents per pound to 40 percent of the selling price. The penalty increase would not apply to flue-cured tobacco until 1947. The bill also requires the Secretary to proclaim marketing quotas for burley and flue-cured for 1947, which in turn would require the holding of a referendum for each kind of tobacco in order to determine if the growers favored marketing quotas.

We have an overproduction of burley tobacco this year, which has hammered down the price on some floors \$20 per 100 pounds. It is a tragic situation. Our burley growers are losing millions of dollars.

A few days ago at a meeting between the burley tobacco growers, the officials of the Department of Agriculture and the OPA, and the House Members from the burley tobacco districts, these amendments were unanimously agreed upon. As a result of the meeting this legislation was introduced. The House Committee on Agriculture the day after the legislation was introduced made a favorable report. It is of the utmost importance that we pass the legislation immediately if the growers are to receive any relief as to the present burley tobacco crop. It is thought that if the tobacco companies are given some assurance that we will not have a surplus crop next year, the price as to the balance of this year's burley crop will go back to around the production cost level at least. The only way we can be assured that there will not be an increase in burley production next year is by the

passage of this legislation which gives the Secretary of Agriculture the right to decrease burley tobacco allotments for 1946 and raises the penalty on excess allotment tobacco.

Unless we get the price up in some way we are going to lose further millions of dollars. We have already lost millions of dollars by reason of the ruinous prices that are now being paid. Most of that money will be lost by smaller farmers, like the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS], whom I see standing, represents. This tobacco money means everything to them.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. May I say to the Members of the House, this is a matter of most vital concern to the small farmers throughout the States that raise burley tobacco. It is their only cash crop. It is a crop which is expensive to grow. It is a crop which requires a year to produce. The seed is sown in February. The final marketing of the tobacco is consummated in January. I recall the time when men who produced it did not even get the cost of its production. Unless we hold it within due bounds the industry will be destroyed and a great many small people will suffer for the necessities of life. It brings in money at Christmas time, when the tax gatherers are at the door, and but for this money Santa Claus would not come.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] if this is not an interference on the part of the New Deal with the law of supply and demand in regard to the price of tobacco.

Mr. JENNINGS. I do not want to split hairs here with the gentleman. I am talking about tobacco.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. As I understand it, this amendment simply puts back into effect the quota system on tobacco.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It gives the Secretary of Agriculture the right to lower burley tobacco allotments for this year. It also increases the penalty on over-allotment tobacco.

Mr. GRANGER. What was the amendment offered by the gentleman? Did that change the penalty?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes; from 50 to 40 percent of the selling price, and the increase in the penalty to 40 percent is not to apply to flue-cured tobacco until 1947.

Mr. GRANGER. It did not change the penalty on tobacco?

Mr. RABAUT. Does it change it from 50 to 40 percent?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the

third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on five different topics, and in connection therewith to include excerpts and newspaper articles.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include excerpts.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the mail I am receiving from my district indicates that the people I represent are intensely interested in two major problems before the Congress.

One of them is the strikes which are slowing down reconversion, slowing down the production of goods, namely, the great steel strike, the strike against General Motors which is affecting practically all of the big automobile manufacturing plants and parts manufacturers, the strike against the big concerns manufacturing electrical appliances and the strikes against the big meat packing concerns which in a few days will stop probably 80 percent of the meat supply of the Nation, refusing the farmers a market for their livestock which is ready to be shipped and prohibiting the people from securing sufficient meat supply throughout the Nation.

Secondly, the people of my district are deeply concerned and many of them are writing me expressing their opposition to the loan or grant to England of the \$4,400,000,000 recently recommended by the President.

These are two questions in which the people Nation-wide are interested. They are questions that will largely have to be solved by the representatives of the people in this Congress, and I take the time of the House today in an effort to make my position clear in the interest of the people of my district and for whatever influence my views may be worth to the Members of the House and in the interest of our country.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing our present unrest growing out of these Nation-wide strikes I think the people should know who is responsible and that the responsibility for this condition should be placed where it properly belongs. The Nation is reaping now the whirlwind of the seeds which have been sown for the past 12 years. The administration now in power has had a big majority in both branches of the Congress for the past 14 years and it is a known fact that the big CIO labor leaders now directing these strikes, for 12 years have been in a political partnership with the administration; that Philip Murray and Sidney Hillman played a dominant role in the reelection of the administration every 4 years, in fact, in the last and most recent national election during the national convention Sidney Hillman at the head of the Political Action Committee of the CIO was called upon and his endorsement was obtained

for Vice President Truman as a running mate for the late President Roosevelt. Sidney Hillman and the Political Action Committee, the political front for the CIO, were most active in the election of the present administration and properly claimed their efforts brought the balance of power to the ticket to make it successful.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 12 years the administration has traded patronage and favors to the CIO leaders for political support.

I am stating a fact when I say that during the past 12 years there has not been made a serious effort by the administration in an attempt to pass legislation that would have definitely defined the rights of capital, labor, and the public, to pass legislation fair and just to labor, fair and just to capital, and that would protect the public interest. The President now does not ask for such legislation.

To the contrary, the House of Representatives in 1941 and in 1942 passed legislation, some of it supported by the American Federation of Labor, which would have prevented much of the industrial unrest that is gripping the Nation today. These bills were not supported by the administration, and for that reason they were allowed to die in the Senate after they had been passed by an overwhelming majority in the House.

Mr. Speaker, now the storm is upon us all over the Nation. Months ago many of us suggested that the laws affecting capital and labor should be revamped in an effort to prevent the condition we find ourselves in today. No effort was made by the administration to give leadership in this direction. The President has recently suggested a 30-day cooling-off period and legislation to make legal a fact-finding board. Neither of these suggestions are sufficient and are only stopgap and emergency makeshifts of doubtful value. Industrial peace cannot be had by quick makeshifts and appeasement moves in this serious situation. They will settle nothing definitely.

The President apparently does not want broad, comprehensive legislation now. His Secretary of Labor, Mr. Schwelienbach, testified recently that all we needed is emergency legislation and that the 30-day cooling-off period and the President's fact-finding board would be sufficient. We have had too much government by men rather than government by law already in dealing with industrial disputes between capital and labor. Power placed in the hands of any President to make practically his own rules and regulations in handling labor disputes is a dangerous move to free enterprise and labor. There is no reason why fair and sound legislation should not be passed clearly defining the rights of capital, labor, and the public. The President can have this if he will insist on it.

Most businessmen and labor leaders who have had time to think the fact-finding proposal through do not believe it is the right approach. In fact, Walter Reuther, who now heads the big United

Automobile Workers' strike against General Motors, is the author of the fact-finding theory. Most businessmen and some of the ablest labor leaders believe it is a dangerous step toward state socialism. It is a known fact that independent auditors for every big corporation audit the books of such corporations every year determining the gross profits and the net profits. All stockholders receive a balance sheet by mail of practically every corporation giving the gross, the expense, and net earnings of the company, also enclosing dividend check where dividends are possible. The SEC and the United States Treasury have these figures because corporations and businessmen must swear to the correctness of these figures in filing their income-tax report to the United States Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, the United States Steel or General Motors, or any corporation, cannot definitely know for the coming year what their profits will be so that at the beginning of the year they can tell how much, if any, raise in wages they can afford to pay the employees working for them. Those who oppose the theory of attempting to make such commitments in advance claim that it would put the bureaucrats in Washington largely in charge of the management of their business for the coming years. It must be apparent that the businessmen at the head of any organization who have devoted years of thought and study to big or small business can operate that business more successfully themselves than if they take into operation partnership the labor leaders and the Government bureaucrats in a three-way management.

There are enough men on both sides of the House in Congress who are courageous enough to put the welfare of the country first and pass well-thought-out, sound legislation, which will protect every legitimate right of labor, yes, the welfare of labor, and protect the rights of those investing their capital and protect the rights of the millions of people who make up the public if the President will use his great power and leadership in that direction.

Obviously, we, in the minority, cannot pass such legislation unless the Chief Executive who heads the majority will bring his pressure to bear on the members of his party most of whom would welcome such a move upon his part. I repeat it cannot be done by makeshift, stopgap, appeasement moves.

Recently the President suggested an 18½-cent-an-hour raise for the steel workers with an increase of possibly \$4 or more per ton in the price of steel. It is not so important to the steel manufacturer what wages he pays if he can pass it on to the public to pay, but such a move does not protect the public's interest. Probably 700,000 steel workers will receive a temporary benefit at the expense of over a hundred million people who make up the general public.

The same sort of a deal is being contemplated in an effort to stop the meat-packers' strike. Is it sound business to buy off these strikes and receive a little temporary relief on the industrial front? If it is maybe that is the right thing to

do to keep the people from going hungry if later on the President will give the proper leadership and the majority party will help enact legislation that will fairly define the rights of all and prevent such Nation-wide unrest from happening again.

I am not judging whether or not the employees should have more money. That I do not know. That should be determined.

But may I point out here that there is grave danger to the Nation in following such a policy. Some prices, particularly in textiles, should be higher in order to get increased production, but there is danger in breaking the line on a wide front.

President Truman in October, I think it was, said, "Failure to hold the price line would be disastrous to the country." If that were true in October, what has happened since then to change his views? If the price of steel is raised and if the price of meat and its byproducts are raised, such action may touch off an inflationary spiral by breaking the price line wide open and start a race between higher wages and higher prices that will be detrimental to a hundred million people and to the very men who are demanding these higher wages today. Such an inflation would penalize millions of other highly organized laboring men, white-collared workers, farmers, housewives, and everyone. It might result in the price of living soaring to such heights that it will more than wipe out the 18½ cents an hour raise for those who seek the benefit of a price raise at this time. The great majority of conservative thinking people, including the majority of the conservative laboring men, are fearful of the results of Nation-wide inflation and they well may be.

If the price of steel is raised \$4 a ton, it will raise much more in the finished product and will add to the increase in price of farm machinery, automobiles and trucks, electrical appliances of every kind, hardware, food, clothing, and shelter.

Mr. Speaker, what the people need and want is a reduction of the high cost of living. To get this we need greater production. To get greater production we need peace on the industrial front that will permit everyone to work. If we can get greater production, we can prevent inflation, and will reduce the cost of living, which will help everyone. That should be our aim and many of the conservative laboring men with whom I talked during the recent recess are more interested in the reduction in the cost of living than they are in securing higher wages at this particular time.

If we can get a greater production of goods, the people will buy more of them, and that will keep labor steadily employed. If we can settle this unrest and establish a confidence through fair legislation between the employer and the employee, the employee will give to the employer more loyal support and a greater production.

Out of that greater production per man-hour the price of goods to the public can be reduced, and because of the greater production the employer will be in a better position to increase the salary

of those who help make the product and therein lies, in my judgment, the best chance for increased wages for the laboring man and steady employment. Most of the thinking Members of Congress, and I believe most of the employers of today, want labor well paid for the service it renders. Years ago that was not the case in probably most instances, but today the average employer realizes among his best customers who buy the merchandise he turns out is the employee as well as the general public. Most Members of Congress know full well that with the national debt approaching \$275,000,000,000 and a greater expense necessary to carry on the current postwar obligation and debt load, that labor must be kept as steadily employed as possible at satisfactory wages. The farmer also must have his fair share in return for his efforts because you cannot have a prosperous country if you neglect the farmer. His rights must be protected.

Most of us realize, however, that the interest of capital which permits employment, the interest of labor which furnishes the manpower, and the interest of the general public which is the greatest purchaser of the combined production of capital and labor all must be protected if we are to carry the debt load ahead of us, prevent inflation for the next 2 or 3 years, and prevent the danger of a depression in the years to follow.

THE BRITISH LOAN

Mr. Speaker, because of the lack of time I shall have to deal very briefly with the important subject of the British loan.

I think all of us wish that our financial situation was such that we could grant such loan to England as would help her with her postwar problems.

The people of this country have always been most benevolent in pouring out their funds to well intentioned nations in distress. The question arises, Can we afford to do it in view of our own financial condition?

I have given serious thought to this question and have determined that I cannot support the British loan recommended by the President.

In the beginning of the war, Premier Churchill said, "Give us the tools and we will do the job." We gave Britain about \$25,000,000,000 in lend-lease and this loan wipes out and forgives the payment for our lend-lease extended to that country, in the settlement.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to our money we threw in millions of men and expended billions of dollars to defeat the Axis Powers. Thousands of our men lost their lives on the continent of Europe and many more thousands were wounded. Our national debt today is said to be greater than all of the national debts combined of all the nations of the world. Our influence is needed in an effort to perpetuate world peace and is being fully given.

If we bankrupt this Nation financially it would be of the greatest detriment not only to our own people but to the future of the world. We cannot exert world strength and world leadership unless we remain strong at home.

If we loan England \$4,400,000,000 we shall have to loan Russia possibly \$6,000,000,000, France, China, Greece, Italy, and other countries large amounts possibly totaling \$20,000,000,000. If we loan England this money and refuse to loan substantial amounts to other nations we will be charged with playing favorites and probably place our Nation in a most embarrassing position. Obviously, we cannot go all the way through and loan this vast amount of money. That is one reason why I shall have to oppose the British loan.

This loan will have to come out of the pockets of the taxpayers. The amount of this loan would pay all the pensions and benefits of every kind for our veterans for the coming year. To get a better idea of how much money this is it would build 1,000,000 homes for our returning soldiers at a cost of \$4,400 per home and today there are over a million returning soldiers who would like to buy or build a home if they had the money.

It establishes an interest rate which begins after the first 5 years when no interest will be paid on the loan, of about 1.68 percent. Our cheapest interest rate for returning soldiers is 4 percent. Obviously, the rate even if it cannot be paid is too low and the contract in this loan requires that interest be paid only when Britain has a favorable trade balance or is able to pay it.

I am against the loan because we cannot afford to give \$4,400,000,000 of the people's money to England at this time. It would be a gift, because if they could not pay a \$4,000,000,000 loan at the end of World War I, they cannot pay this loan we are now contemplating. As you know, the last loan was never paid and never will be, for World War I.

I am against the loan because the British Empire has vast resources all over the world in gold, diamonds, rubber, tin, lumber, and copper, all of which the United States could use and the British Empire could spare to pay on this loan.

I am against the loan because I do not believe I have the right or should take the responsibility of giving away billions of dollars of the people's money and commit them to pay such billions of dollars through taxes because I, as their Representative, decided to place this burden upon them.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman knows, of course, that we have others besides the GI's that we must take care of with homes at the present time. We are told by the authorities, who ought to know, that there is desperate need for 5,000,000 homes in the United States today. How we are going to meet this need is beyond me. I do not see how we are going to do it, because no encouragement whatsoever is being given to private industry to furnish any part of these homes. As far as home construction by the Government itself is concerned, I do not believe it can even partially take care of this situation.

Mr. VURSELL. I think the gentleman's remarks are timely. In reply, I

would say that obviously we cannot carry on a program anywhere near meeting the needs without tremendous expense. Certainly we could better use our money, this \$4,400,000,000, to help build homes for the veterans, in my judgment, than to grant this loan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I agree entirely with the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You may have the figures right as to how many homes that \$4,400,000,000 would build, but this OPA and the administration policies have us in a condition now that I would like to ask the gentleman, Where are you going to get the lumber and where are you going to get the material to build those houses? You cannot buy them on the market today. Not only that, if you build these homes for the veterans and things keep on the way they are, if Members who have been returning from the Midwest and the West have the situation accurately in mind, and they say there is no feed for the cattle out there, where are you going to get the meat, where are you going to get the butter, and where are you going to get the cheese, and where are you going to get the clothing? The OPA has driven all the low-price clothing off the market. What have we got left now?

Mr. VURSELL. We have not got a very sound foundation and it will take a lot of work and a lot of planning and a lot of efficient government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOYLE). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. PITTINGER. Does the gentleman have any idea that they ever intend to pay any of this loan or any other loan that is ever made to them? Are they not just figuring this as a hand-out by Santa Claus?

Mr. VURSELL. I believe, in answer to the gentleman's question, that there is justification for that thought because at the very beginning of negotiations they did not want the loan but wanted a grant.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Why would it not be possible for us to make a trade with England and give them this money for bases in the Western Hemisphere? There are numerous islands all over the Caribbean which belong to England that we could well use. Then we would not have any doubt as to the repayment of this money and they would be getting something and we would be getting something.

Mr. VURSELL. Frankly, I think the gentleman has raised an interesting point. I think we have been too quick and too magnanimous in trading with England in reference to this loan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter which he received from an American Legion post.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the 31st day of January after the disposition on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOYLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 45 minutes.

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, during the time at my disposal, I shall speak about certain impressions in connection with the foreign policy of the United States that were gleaned by me in traveling in Europe during the past summer; also, impressions that were gained when I served as a delegate to the United Nations Educational and Cultural Conference in London from the 1st to the 16th of November.

During last summer it was my privilege to travel with several of my colleagues throughout the countries in western Europe, in the Balkans, and in the Middle East. We went as far east as India. We were gone from the 20th of July until about the 22d of September, covering a total distance of about 35,000 miles and visiting over 30 countries.

During that period we flew with the Air Transport Command. The planes were piloted, of course, by members of the United States Army.

The second time we went to London I was a delegate to the Educational and Cultural Conference. On that occasion I flew the Atlantic again, making a total of four crossings during the summer and fall.

Flying the Atlantic Ocean is no longer a novelty. It would have been a few years ago. I think it is important to realize that it was only 42 years ago last December that the first flight was made by a heavier-than-air machine. Since that time aviation has developed tremendously. It takes only a few hours to fly from the United States to London or from the United States to Cairo or from the United States to anywhere else on the surface of this globe.

In connection with aviation I wish to emphasize one thing which seems to me to be very important. I make this point at the very beginning: Those of you who have traveled in Europe and in the other theaters of warfare know that the air routes of the world have been blazed by American fliers. You know that through the genius of our industry we have built the great planes which are today flying

the seas and are covering all the continents on the surface of the earth. Our group had an opportunity to visit Moscow. We flew from Berlin to Moscow and then again from Moscow to Berlin in a plane manned by the Russians, but it was a C-47 manufactured, I presume, in the United States and probably given to Russia through lend-lease. Perhaps it reached the Soviet Union across Iran where many of our supplies went in.

I recall one day landing in Abadan at the head of the Persian Gulf. As members of the party stepped out of the plane it seemed rather hot and I asked one of the GI's just how warm it was. He said it was 115 in the shade. "But," he continued, "you gentlemen should have been here when it was really hot."

And I asked, "Well, how hot does it get here?"

And he said, "We have experienced heat as high as 187 degrees."

And, mind you, our materials went up across Iran during this war to the Soviet Union in this intense heat. I thought as I visited that theater of operations—and as I visited the various theaters of warfare, the Mediterranean theater, the European theater, the Africa-Middle East theater, the Persian Gulf Command, and the India-Burma theater—I thought as I visited those theaters and saw how great had been the American investment in dollars, and more important than that, how great had been the American sacrifice of lives and under what conditions this war had been fought, I thought to myself we have a tremendous stake in this world, and that we should be proud of the job our boys have done on every front. I thought of the tremendous sacrifice that they made and I wished that every American could see under what conditions our men fought all over the world.

We flew with the Air Transport Command. The landing fields were built by Americans, the planes were developed by our industry, and our young pilots flew them all over the world. When we were flying in the Middle East I asked the young man who was piloting us over a range of mountains similar to the Rocky Mountains how long he had been flying; and he said for 3 years and that he had over 2,000 hours. I said, "It looks as though we are pretty close to the mountain peaks."

He said, "Well, we are flying about 200 feet above them, but there is no turbulence so there is no danger. Would you feel better if we were to go higher?"

And I replied, "No, sir; you are the boss of this plane." But I said to myself as I looked out and saw another great ridge of mountains approaching, "I hope we get over that ridge."

I asked, "How old are you?"

He replied, "22 years of age."

The point I wish to emphasize at this moment is that we have air supremacy everywhere in this world and I think this air supremacy should be maintained at all costs. In other words, by maintaining air supremacy and by insisting upon it we can make the greatest contribution to the protection of American interests and the greatest contribution to the building of an organization which will preserve the peace of the future. I am

fearful at times that perhaps our interests are not being protected with the insight with which they should be protected and that perhaps this air supremacy will be lost.

As we went from capital to capital and from country to country I was very much interested in the political and economic conditions. I wish to speak very briefly about some of these conditions.

I introduced a resolution when I returned, for instance, for a full investigation of UNRRA. I felt that before voting funds for this organization a thorough study ought to be made. I will tell you why I introduced the resolution. I introduced it because I became convinced as I traveled in the Balkans and other sections that UNRRA was being used to assist certain regimes that might some day even plague the United States of America and I, therefore, felt that a thorough investigation should be made.

I was convinced that we were supplying through UNRRA, and we pay about 72 percent of the bill for this organization, funds and property that were being employed in many instances to send materials into certain countries, materials that had been taken out by other powers and perhaps by the armies of other nations. We have been asked in the message that was delivered here yesterday to make another appropriation for this organization. If we continue appropriating money without a full investigation of the whole situation, I am afraid that some day we are going to realize that perhaps we have given away too much of the United States of America.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman mentioned the President's message of yesterday. The President stated that we should give more to UNRRA. The gentleman should state the amount, which was \$1,200,000,000. I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Truman, or somebody else, Where are you going to get that money?

Mr. MERROW. Well, that is what I do not know. I thank the gentleman for stating the specific amount. I intended to do so later.

Mr. Speaker, this leads me to say that in my travels I followed the practice of asking various leaders whenever the opportunity arose, what they expected from the United States. That is rather an important question because I assure you that all expect something in one way or another. As a matter of fact, when I was at the London Conference and we were setting up the constitution for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization the greatest and the most important question to come before the United States delegation was, How much are you going to give to help rebuild the educational facilities in the devastated countries? It took considerable arguing to convince them that we were not there for the purpose of writing a constitution to set up a fund-raising and a fund-disbursing agency.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe we have given the impression, through the State Department and the

heads of our Government, during the past 10 years that all they need to do is to ask us for it and we will give it to them, all without regard to who is going to pay it and what load they will saddle on the taxpayers of this country when they promise all these things to the nations of the world? It seems to me it is about time for America to look after America if we are going to have any America left.

Mr. MERROW. I appreciate that statement more than I can tell the gentleman, and during the course of my remarks I shall speak about a resolution which I have introduced which will provide a thorough and complete investigation of the State Department. I believe that the State Department and the foreign service of this country should be investigated thoroughly so that we will know in what way American interests are being cared for in every section of the world. While I am speaking of this, let me say that I have talked with members of our armed services, and every one of them with whom I spoke agreed with the conclusions I have reached, and again and again they asked me, "Why in the world does not the Congress of the United States do something about the American foreign policy?"

Mr. RICH. I hope that the gentleman gets the resolution passed because if he can do so he will be doing one of the greatest things for America that anyone has done for this country in a long time. I congratulate the gentleman on what he is trying to do.

Mr. MERROW. I appreciate those remarks. I shall discuss shortly the resolution which I introduced on the 29th of November.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman been promised a hearing?

Mr. MERROW. I have not asked for a hearing, I have not been promised a hearing; I have mentioned the matter on the floor of the House several times. The resolution is pending before the Rules Committee and I hope that a hearing will be granted very soon.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it a matter that will come from the Rules Committee or from the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. MERROW. It will have to come from the Rules Committee because the resolution requires an investigation and appoints a select committee of the House consisting of 23 Members to study and investigate the foreign policy of this country. An accompanying resolution calls for an appropriation of \$50,000 to start the work of the committee. The resolutions are House Resolution 433 and House Resolution 434.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are vitally interesting.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman if this resolution has been

prompted as a result of his experiences in other countries this past year?

Mr. MERROW. Yes. May I say to the gentleman that if I have gained anything in traveling in over 30 countries, if I have gained anything from being in London as a delegate to the Educational Conference, it is this: We must move immediately to see if we can develop a firm, realistic objective foreign policy for the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Has the gentleman had occasion to discuss this sort of thing with the men in the military service and, if he has, has there been a particular reaction by them?

Mr. MERROW. There has been a very definite reaction. I am glad the gentleman asked the question. I have spoken on this resolution before audience after audience up and down my own State. Invariably, whenever servicemen were in the audience they would come to me and say, "We are with you. We saw it. We realize that something ought to be done. Why is it that there is any hesitancy on the part of our Government in being firm and realistic? Why is there any hesitancy on finding out what we want as far as our foreign policy is concerned? Why is there any hesitancy on the part of investigating the State Department and the foreign service?" They have come to me and said, "If you could see what is taking place in the various capitals as we have seen it, you would argue for such a move even more strenuously than you do."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman. As a Member of his committee, I want to assure him of my full support in his efforts to get this resolution reported out.

Mr. MERROW. I certainly thank the gentleman, and I am grateful for his efforts in helping to get this resolution out.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is making a very constructive suggestion as to what might be done. As one who traveled in Europe with the gentleman who has the floor, I can appreciate the force of his remarks. I think what the gentleman is trying to tell the Congress and the people of America is this: It remains to be seen whether or not we can be as wise in Europe as we have been generous.

Mr. MERROW. That is right. I appreciate the statement from the gentleman who traveled with us during many hours flying over the continent of Europe. I am glad that he agrees with the conclusions that I have drawn.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. Supplementing the words of the gentleman from Michigan, are they not almost the words that a group of GI's from our country, as well as two men from the Government of Norway, stated to the gentleman in Oslo when they said that the American Government has been the most generous,

it is the most powerful, but it is about time it is getting the most smart. I believe the gentleman heard that statement not only in Oslo but in a great many capitals of Europe.

Mr. MERROW. I heard that statement, and I would like to make this comment in connection with it: I returned from Europe last summer depressed for the simple reason I had seen the might of the United States of America, I had seen the generosity of the United States of America, but I had failed to see the statesmanship of the United States of America in foreign affairs. I think it is a statement that cannot be too often repeated. We have shown how powerful we are, how generous we are, but we have not shown how wise we are.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MERROW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman and I both are members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Does not the gentleman feel that full and complete information as to what our foreign policy really is should be given to the Committee on Foreign Affairs? I think that the soldier, the so-called GI, should be informed as to what our foreign policy is. No soldier would want to return to the United States before the time that he felt there was any need for him in the foreign countries, because that is the kind of soldier our American soldier makes.

Mr. MERROW. That is well said, and it is our duty to see if we can develop a policy so that we know where we are going. The reason I have asked for a select committee of 23 members to study and investigate is because I realize that it is a huge task. It will require great fearlessness. The committee will have much work to do, and it is necessary that this study be made, not only here in Washington but elsewhere. The committee must go to other countries in order to secure the facts and only then can recommendations be made to the Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not the gentleman's understanding that it is the policy of the administration to keep at least a million or two Americans abroad to police and rebuild or rehabilitate, as they call it, the rest of the world?

Mr. MERROW. Apparently it is.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman believe in that?

Mr. MERROW. No; I do not necessarily believe in that, but I think we ought to find out just how many we need abroad to protect our interests.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman go along with me so far as to say that if that is going to be our policy, to keep our men over there, we should leave it entirely to volunteers, and not keep conscripting Americans to police other parts of the world?

Mr. MERROW. Leave it to volunteers if we can get enough, but, mind you, we have to determine what our interests are

and how much these interests must be protected. I agree with what the gentleman is trying to say.

Mr. HOFFMAN. For the last 3 or 4 years there has been a fight here in the Congress between the internationalists and those who favor the United States of the World, which has simmered down to the UNO. I have noticed that the internationalists and those who favor this international organization, if they are too old to go, have not shown any great enthusiasm toward contributing their money. They want us to vote the taxpayers' money and conscript young Americans. I do not believe in that.

Mr. MERROW. As long as the word "internationalist" has been mentioned, may I say that we cannot avoid being internationalists. The world is too small. When you can go from the United States to Europe in a period of 21 hours, that is a short time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all right, but that is no reason why we should take over the job of policing them, educating them, telling them what religion they should believe in, or doing all of their housework.

Mr. MERROW. We will have to do our part to prevent aggression in the future. Certainly we cannot remain isolated. I am not arguing for that point of view, but I think we should examine our own interests in every section.

I want to speak very frankly about the political situation as I saw it. In the first place, I would make this observation: That no matter where you go, whether in the Scandinavian countries, in western Europe, in the Balkans, or in the Middle East, you find great fear of the Soviet Union. I hope nothing I say will be interpreted as anti-Russian or antian anyone else. No matter where one goes in any of the countries over there, one finds a fairly active Communist Party and one finds communism functioning very well in many countries.

I am not surprised at the controversy in connection with Iran. We were in Teheran. Members of the Chamber of Deputies came to us and said, "Do you thoroughly appreciate, do you understand what the political situation in this country is?" When you would ask, "What is it?" they would reply, "The Russian question. We want to be left alone."

I talked with several of them at some length, and I said, "It appears to me from what you have stated that you would like the United States of America to tell the Soviet Union to move out of this country." They agreed that that was what they would like to have done. One draws the conclusion that possibly there is an attempt on the part of the Russian Government to control politically and economically every country that she can control that is on her borders, and perhaps even farther than her borders.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You do not need to cross the sea to find that. All you need to do is read the publications of the PAC and the CIO. Their ambition is to take over political and economic domination in this country.

Mr. MERROW. As far as the policy of the Soviet Union is concerned it seems to be realistic. The Russians seem to know what they want. They seem to know where they are going.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will you answer me this? You have no doubt about where they are going, or where they want to go, rather, in this country. You know they want to divide all profits, they want to divert profits from repairs and replacements and extensions and research, profits that industry may make, into wages. That is all right for an ambition, but if you do it then we are through here.

Mr. MERROW. I am sorry, I do not want to yield further at this time to discuss the situation in this country. I am talking about the foreign policy. I just want to make clear that as far as the Soviet Union is concerned—and this is nothing against it—they apparently know what they want in connection with foreign policy.

Now, to go elsewhere. As one travels through the Middle East, northern Africa, about the Mediterranean, and in other sections he finds that Britain knows what she wants as far as foreign policy is concerned, knows exactly what she wants—preservation of Empire.

I have no objection to that, only I would like to know just how far we are going in assisting her to preserve the Empire and what interests we have involved. That is only one of the many things I would like to find out by a special committee of the House.

To summarize very briefly, the question that is most discussed is the foreign policy of the United States. The question most frequently asked whether at home or abroad is, "What is the foreign policy of the United States?" And the comment you hear most frequently is, "The United States has no foreign policy."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman is a very active member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I wonder if he can tell me what our foreign policy is as related to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania?

Mr. MERROW. I cannot, and I would like to have an investigation so that we might know what it is. If I knew what our foreign policy is in reference to these various sections, I would not be standing here demanding a study of our foreign policy and an investigation of the State Department and the foreign service in every section of the world.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Might I say to the gentleman that I believe there is as much confusion in the State Department and the White House as there is in our own committee.

Mr. MERROW. You are indeed right.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. May I make an observation? On January 8, President Truman said we had recognized the dictator government in Yugoslavia only conditionally. The State Department immediately countered and said we had recognized Yugoslavia unconditionally. There seems to be a conflict as between the White House and the State Department. In other words, it justifies the

position the gentleman has taken in this matter.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman for that observation. May I say in reference to the Balkans, everything apparently is controlled by the Soviet Union with the exception of tiny Greece. I was told again and again when we were in Greece that the only place the Anglo-Saxon has any opportunity of exerting influence for democracy, so far as the Balkans are concerned, is in Greece. Now when you see the confusion you have just mentioned, it is about time for the representatives of the people to try to do something in response to a desire that is spreading from one end of this country to the other that we formulate if we can a foreign policy to guide us in the troublous times ahead.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have a communication from numerous Lithuanians who naturally are very greatly disturbed about the whole situation. It is a very difficult situation because I, and apparently nobody else, can promise them any security or any real help. It is a most deplorable, unfortunate, and tragic situation.

I feel that both committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, should be given the most complete information as to what is going on abroad, which is information that our State Department has, and tell us first of all the foreign policy. We are the first committee to carry out and legislate for any foreign policy that we may have. As it is, we do not know, and nobody seems to know, what our foreign policy is. Today it is a merry-go-round, and a most unfortunate and tragic merry-go-round.

Mr. MERROW. It certainly is. I wish to summarize, if I may, very briefly the resolution I have introduced. I think if it is worth anything to the Government of the United States to send a Member of Congress abroad, then he ought to be willing frankly and freely to state his impressions and state them without fear or favor. The resolution I have introduced is the result of the contacts I made, and what I learned and observed while I was traveling last summer. And one message I have tried to convey ever since I have returned is that it is extremely tragic for this great power to move to the future without definite aims and without definite objectives. The thing that we need most, the thing we need more than anything else, is a firm, realistic, and definite foreign policy.

We may not like it, but we are involved in a game of international power politics, playing with governments who are extremely realistic, sometimes ruthlessly realistic. It is about time we understand the world political situation.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. In a great many countries last summer you heard the leaders in those countries, with whom you consulted, say, "Yes; Russia knows what she wants."

Mr. MERROW. That is right.

Mr. RAMEY. And "Britain knows what she wants."

Mr. MERROW. That is right.

Mr. RAMEY. "And advertises it. But the trouble with your country is, she does not know what she wants when she sits down at the table." I remember you asked Ambassador Kirk in your discussion, "What have you got to say about communism?" That is our Ambassador in Italy.

Mr. MERROW. Yes.

Mr. RAMEY. And he said, "Far more than that, it seems as though about one-third of the people are drifting into anarchy. They pretend to repeat the philosophy of Lenin, but they go beyond that, and they say, 'Let us do away with all government. All government has let us down.'" He said, "It is getting that wild." Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. MERROW. Yes; I remember that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The United States is the richest and most powerful Nation in the world today. We won a magnificent victory in war. We ought to do it in peace. Today I have the feeling that almost the only reason we are respected, because we are so vastly weak in our policy, is because we have the strength to back it up.

Mr. MERROW. That is right. I talked with members of the British Parliament during the short time I was in London. They look upon us as a young Nation. I seemed to get the impression that the feeling was that we did not know what we wanted. We are extremely wealthy. They hope they can get something from us, but as far as our policy is concerned, they think we are vacillating.

After I returned I decided something ought to be done, or at least there should be some movement to try to correct the situation. So I finally introduced a resolution on the 29th of November. I am going to talk about it briefly.

My resolution, first, calls for a select committee of this House of 23 members, to be appointed by the Speaker, whose duty it will be to review the foreign policy in every country and in every section. By "section" I mean western Europe, the Balkans, the Middle East, India, the Far East, and so on. Why do I say "different sections"? Because each part of the world presents different problems. When we were between Beirut and Damascus I spent probably 2 hours walking up and down in front of the hotel between 11 o'clock and 1 o'clock in the morning talking to our Ambassador out there in the Middle East. He was pleading for a definite policy as far as the Middle East is concerned. He said, "The people out here are friendly to us." He continued, "It seems to me that somehow we should develop a policy as far as the different sections of the world are concerned, and with reference to every country."

I have asked that the committee have full power to investigate the Department of State and the foreign service of

the United States. I am convinced there is much to be desired as far as the foreign service is concerned. I make no charges against anyone, but I wish to point out I have heard many criticisms again and again. For instance, it is stated, many people in the foreign service have been away from the United States for so long they have lost the American point of view. I believe that they should be returned to this country frequently so that they will not forget the American point of view. They are not paid enough money. We should increase their salaries, so that we will get the best people, to represent our country.

I have asked for an investigation of the foreign service and the State Department so as to ascertain the truth concerning these matters.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have felt strongly that the foreign-service officers are not paid enough money. I also know it is very embarrassing for them, because they do not know what our foreign policy is. They are sent to foreign lands and frequently they have no instructions. They do not know what our policy is. How can they? Because we have none.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman for that contribution. Apparently we do not have any. That is why it is necessary to make the proposed study. They should know. The Department of State is the arm that represents us, that carries out whatever foreign policy we have. Certainly we should be definite as to what we wish in the foreign capitals.

We have heard the British loan discussed here on the floor today. Do we know what we want as far as the British loan is concerned? I suppose we shall have a full and frank discussion of that situation here in the House. Certainly it will require much study and much thought to determine whether or not our interests are properly cared for before we extend the money.

If we are going to lend the money to the British Empire, or any other country for that matter, I think we ought to be very careful and know that our interests are safeguarded. It is necessary that we know what we wish; and when I say "know what we wish" I mean that we should know what we wish for instance in respect to aviation. We ought to study our interests before we extend a loan to any country. Such matters should be thoroughly investigated by a committee of this Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman spoke of the British loan and loans to other foreign governments. The gentleman is making a very interesting and informative address. I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me that before we extend these loans to Britain or any other country we should receive from the President a list of the loans he proposes to recommend to foreign countries this year.

Mr. MERROW. Yes, by all means; I agree. I think a committee of this House should be set up for that purpose, to go into those matters, and that we should have a report to the representatives of the people as to the exact situation with suggestions as to what ought to be done.

I have asked that this committee be set up to investigate the Department of State. I make no charges. I allude to repeated criticisms I have heard. I have heard, for instance, that there is a pro-British group in the Department of State, that there is a pro-Communist group in the Department of State, that the Department does not know what it is going to do or in what direction it is going to move; that there is evidence of too much clerical mindedness, and that there is evidence of internal strife. You have heard and I have heard these criticisms. They are serious statements, and it is about time that we attempt to find out whether or not there is any foundation for them. If there is a foundation for them, then something should be done about it; if there is no foundation for such statements, then it should be made perfectly clear. I think it is only fair that an investigation be made of the whole department, that it be made fearlessly, that the investigation not be whitewashed, because, after all, this is the arm of our Government which is conducting foreign policy, and, believe me—and I think you will agree with me—foreign policy is going to affect us more in the future than it ever has in the past. It has affected us greatly during the past 4 or 5 years with the money we have spent and the lives we have lost, and it will affect us more in the future. We should have such a committee as I suggest to try to find the truth, to probe the situation and give us the information.

I have asked, furthermore, that this committee report every 90 days to the House of Representatives and make its final report at the end of this session of the Congress. I have asked that this committee be empowered to make recommendations as to the development of an over-all foreign policy which will best protect the interests of the United States of America. I think it is high time that we should be extremely concerned in protecting the interests of this great country. I have asked that this committee be empowered to make recommendations as to how the State Department and the arm of our foreign service can be improved.

I have asked also that this committee make recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to methods for securing adequate and up-to-date information concerning world conditions. I feel that the other nations—and I know that some of you who traveled with me feel likewise—seem to be getting the true facts through their intelligence service which shows that our intelligence service is inferior. It is about time that we had an intelligence service that can get accurate information concerning world conditions. Only recently I have read statements by various columnists in ref-

erence to the gathering of information concerning foreign affairs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. When one of our foreign officers does gather and send to Washington correct information about foreign governments, if it does not seem to be popular here that foreign officer has his head cut off, whereas in the case of a foreign officer of another country, when he brings in information that officer is backed up and supported instead of having his head cut off.

Mr. MERROW. Yes. Unfortunately this situation does exist. I appreciate the contribution the gentleman has made because she has lived with foreign questions for many years, she has traveled widely and she has been close to various phases of foreign policy. Every statement she has made is evidence that a fearless probe of the entire foreign policy and of the Department of State is imperative. The gentleman has probably had closer connection with the State Department than anyone else. She has seen it and worked with it over a long period of time.

I have asked that the committee make recommendations with respect to the communication of information to the people of the United States. Two things are all important, namely, the gathering of information and the transmission of information to the people. I am convinced that if the people have the correct information they will be in a better position to make up their minds on the important matters of foreign policy.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Bearing in mind the question of the purpose of the gentleman's resolution, let me remind him that certain top secret files have been stolen out of the State Department within the last year and were found in a Communist office 250 miles away from Washington.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman. That is another reason why we should have a probe of the State Department and a probe of the foreign service. I am grateful for the contribution that has been made by my colleagues who traveled with me last summer. I think from what the gentleman from Michigan has said he agrees with me that my resolution ought to be adopted by the House. In fact, I believe the people are looking to the Congress to do something about foreign policy. It is our duty to take the initiative.

As I previously emphasized, the one thing that stood out as I talked with different people in various capitals, is that we do not have the realism which is necessary, that this country is probably too sentimental. We have not been in international power politics as long as some of the others and perhaps this is the reason. The fact remains, we are a great nation. Someone said on the floor this afternoon, we are the greatest nation on the face of the earth. I do

not say that in any attempt to brag because with great power comes heavy responsibility. We have leadership. As has also been said on the floor, we have proved that we are exceedingly generous. There is nothing wrong with possessing tremendous power. It is the way in which that power is used which is all important. If we are to employ our power effectively for the purpose of building a peaceful world, which we hope to do because we know if we cannot build a peaceful world then we may have another war, we must be as wise as we know how and we have to exert every ounce of our energy to develop the type of policy which will best serve our interests.

We are attempting at the moment to set up an international organization. I have long felt that we must have such an international organization to preserve peace. I feel that it is one of the bright spots in this whole dark picture that the United Nations is now getting under way in the city of London. It is probably the first step. It will be a long, hard road to develop world unity so that the nations will not fight again. We must play a leading role in laying the foundations for the peace of tomorrow. We will exert great influence in the United Nations Organization as in every other specialized international agency. Only in this way can we avert future aggression.

I was pleased during the Educational Conference in London to see how splendidly the United States delegation exercised leadership in writing the constitution for the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization which we propose to set up after 20 nations have ratified the constitution.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. I have great respect for the gentleman because of the work that he has done and the research he has made in this field. But does not the gentleman feel that we, as the greatest Nation on the face of the earth at the present time, have exercised our powers of leadership in this world during the last year as it has never been exercised before?

Mr. MERROW. I think we have exercised our powers of leadership, but I am very fearful of the future. We exercised outstanding leadership in winning the war. I am afraid we are not exercising such leadership in winning the peace.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman will admit that we were the moving power in the creation and development of UNO.

Mr. MERROW. Yes; and very happily so.

Mr. RICHARDS. And so far progress has been made.

Mr. MERROW. Up to date.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman has criticized the foreign policy of the United States as it is today. Is it not a fact that the foreign policy of the United States as outlined by the present President of the United States and the present Secretary of State is the clearest and most forceful foreign policy that has been enunciated by the United States since the days of the Monroe Doctrine?

Mr. MERROW. I certainly do not agree to that.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman has unjustly criticized the administration in this connection.

Mr. MERROW. I have criticized it, yes. I stand on my criticism. I have not criticized as much as it should be. But go ahead.

Mr. RICHARDS. All right. I assert that we have had the most virile and effective foreign policy during the last few years that we have had during the last 100 years.

Mr. MERROW. You certainly have made a broad assertion. No; I cannot agree with you. Our policy is neither virile nor positive. For instance, you know the situation in the Balkans, where they are completely controlled by the Soviet Union. We have stated again and again that we want free governments in these various countries. There is no such thing as freedom there today. What are we going to do about it?

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman will admit that it is very difficult to enunciate a formula of foreign policy for every nation on the face of the earth in the light of existing and rapidly changing world conditions.

Mr. MERROW. We should try to formulate a policy for every country. We must stand firm and not yield to other powers on every point.

Mr. RICHARDS. My reason for interrupting the gentlemen is because he made the broad statement that the United States had no foreign policy at the present time.

Mr. MERROW. It does not have, insofar as I have been able to ascertain.

Mr. RICHARDS. I want to reiterate that if we have ever had a strong and effective foreign policy it is today, and the backbone of that policy is international cooperation. President Truman and Secretary Byrnes are manfully trying to convince the nations of the world that they must hang together or hang separately.

Mr. MERROW. That is a most general statement. What are you going to do about a situation, such as in Iran, for instance, where the members of the Government come to you and say: "The agreements that were made in respect to this country are not being lived up to"? It is about time that we decide what we wish in the various sections of the world and then stand firmly. Cooperation is a two-way road. I am for world cooperation, but I want the other powers to do their part in cooperating. We cannot do it all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a radio broadcast he delivered over the weekend.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next,

at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE STEEL STRIKE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday several Members of the House, including myself, spoke on the steel strike. In the course of our remarks several of us made the charge that in our opinion there was a conspiracy on the part of Wall Street Bourbons to provoke a national economic crisis which they hoped would result in the smashing of labor organizations and in the weakening of liberal legislation passed by the Roosevelt administration. Several Members have come to me and asked if I could produce any kind of factual evidence that led to my conclusions. This afternoon I want to lay certain facts concerning the strike and the events that led up to it before the House. I think there is only one logical conclusion that anyone can draw from those facts.

May I remind you that when the United Steel Workers of America raised its demand in September for a \$2 a day increase, the United States Steel Co. replied that it was impossible for the company to consider any wage increases under the present ceilings on steel, maintaining that it was very doubtful if under present ceilings the steel company could make a profit. Therefore, said United States Steel and the smaller companies, it would be impossible to raise wages.

That situation continued. The steel companies remained adamant. They said, "We cannot pay any increase if ceilings stay where they are." The union insisted that they had to have the \$2 increase in wages if they were to maintain the purchasing power of their employees on a wartime level, and hence do their part in establishing a standard of living in this country 50 percent higher than we had previously known during peacetime as War Mobilization Director Vinson maintained in his July 1, 1944, report was necessary to maintain a stable economy.

We come past the first of the year. The strike had been set for the 14th of January, after a strike vote duly taken under the Smith-Connally Act. You will recall that 2 days before the strike was to take place the President of the United States requested Philip Murray, the president of the United Steel Workers of America, to postpone the strike for 1 week and to bargain further with Mr. Fairless, representing United States Steel and all the other steel companies of America. Mr. Murray, in the interest of the public, acceded to that request and the strike was postponed for 1 week.

Further conferences were held. During the course of the conferences the steel union dropped its demand for 25

cents an hour to 19.5 cents an hour, and the company, speaking through Mr. Fairless, came up to 15 cents an hour. There they were deadlocked. They told the President that there was nothing more they could do.

The President then announced his solution. He said that in his opinion an 18.5 cents an hour increase would be a fair settlement of the controversy. The union accepted the proposal of the President of the United States. Mr. Fairless turned it down.

Now I want to repeat here, as I said yesterday, that I am convinced on the basis of information which has reached me that Mr. Fairless would probably have been willing to accept the 18.5 cents an hour, but certain Wall Street interests and certain other steel companies, those represented by gentlemen like Tom Girdler and Eugene Grace, refused to go along with the President of the United States. They have defied the top representative of the people of this country.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Can we not imagine what would have been said on the floor of this House and what tirades would have been inveighed against labor if it had been labor that had refused the recommendation of the President?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I think the gentleman from New York has made a very pertinent observation. I, too, have been conjecturing in my own mind the outburst we would have heard on this floor had labor refused to go along with the President.

But I have noticed with great interest that those who are so quick to rise to their feet and assail labor when they feel that labor allegedly is defying the Government have been singularly silent in any remarks about the steel barons and the Wall Street economic Bourbons of this country who are openly defying the President.

Now, I want to give you the figures upon which the President was basing his offer and his belief that he had made an eminently fair offer. You will recall that the President announced—and here is the crux of the whole thing—in the terms of that offer the President had announced that the administration was willing to grant \$4 a ton increase in steel prices. That \$4 a ton increase would have meant an additional income to the steel companies of this country of \$200,000,000—based upon the lowest estimate of probable steel production in 1946—50,000,000 tons. The 18½ cents an hour increase which the President proposed would have meant an expense to the steel companies of \$180,000,000—based upon the highest employment of the past year—460,000 men in the basic steel plants of the country. Please note those figures—\$200,000,000 additional income and \$180,000,000 additional outgo. In addition, it is probable that overtime would have almost entirely disappeared in the steel plants during this coming year. There is ample evidence for that in the fact that by October 1945 the average weekly hours in steel plants in this country were already down to 41.8. If

overtime had vanished completely, as most of us assume it would during the year 1946, that would have meant another additional saving to the steel companies of this country of \$90,000,000 in comparison with the wage bills that they have been meeting during the war period.

So you have definite figures here showing that the steel companies under the President's proposal would have had a much greater income than their additional expenses would have been. For that reason I maintain that we can come to no other possible conclusion but that the refusal on the part of the steel companies and the Wall Street Bourbons who control them to accept the President's offer was that they want to provoke an economic crisis. They want to see a situation develop in which they hope our economy will become so disorganized that they may lead some unsuspecting Members of the Congress into repealing some very important and basic social and economic legislation and that they may by simply shutting their doors starve out the workers of this country and force them to come to terms.

I think people who are willing to toy in that fashion with our economic stability—I think that those who are willing for their own selfish ends to threaten the very industry which is the lifeblood of this country, and hence threaten every industry in the United States with stagnation, such people are definitely assailing the Government of the United States. They care naught for the welfare of the people.

It is for that reason that many Members, including myself, made the speeches we did yesterday and that I again take the floor today to make these few brief remarks so that I might lay these facts before you. I remind you once more that the President's plan would have given the steel companies a greater additional income than his wage proposal would have added expenses to their balance sheets. Furthermore, the figures I have given you are conservative. There is every reason to believe production would be greater than 50,000,000 tons, possibly reaching 60,000,000, and that employment might be lower, possibly as low as 425,000. In that event, the gains of the steel companies would be even larger than under the conservative figures I used earlier. All the more reason, I repeat, that the only possible conclusion one can draw is that a conspiracy is under way.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. If we are sure of these figures which you have, and I am not saying that I doubt them, but am saying that I believe them, I think these figures should by some means be gotten out to the American people at once. We have heard of a word "smearbund." We used to hear the words that "labor has been 'smearbund' the people." In the last 30 days, it has been labor that has been the recipient of an unjust "smearbund" which is caused by a letter. Someone is getting out the word to the country that labor is doing all this. In all fairness, labor is not doing all this and there is

an unjust attack going on against labor trying to cause the American people to believe it is all their fault. Now, we know this is not the case. I want to compliment the gentlemen, because he has given the exact figures showing what the steel companies may have as profit. I think that should be given to the American people, because labor has been unjustly criticized, in view of these figures, by saying they are the whole cause of the uprising. I would like to see those figures transmitted throughout this land, because John Q. Public wants to be fair and he wants to know the facts. I think the gentleman has made an excellent contribution in giving us those figures.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. I agree with him, and am also perturbed about the false accusations that have been made in many parts of this country against labor organizations. My major purpose in taking the floor today was simply to lay these basic facts before the Congress for the perusal of the Members and for their judgment, as they formulate their views on the current steel strike.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH (at the request of Mr. MARCANTONIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include correspondence between the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Hensel, and himself.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on January 28, following any other special orders that may have been entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOYLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain statements and excerpts from the President's message of yesterday, from the report of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Mr. John W. Snyder, and certain other statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COUNTRY CAN BE ON VERGE OF ECONOMIC COLLAPSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we can be on the verge of economic collapse not by reason of many of the things that we see in the headlines of the papers every day but by reason of our most dreaded enemy, which is our No. 1 problem—inflation.

While the young men of our country saved us on the 55 battle fronts of the world during the war, they can come back here and see our country engulfed

in inflation and be disillusioned by reason of the fact that the money they have saved can possibly become worthless. We do not want those conditions to happen. Today we are facing a real challenge, the greatest challenge that any Congress or the people of any nation has ever faced in time of peace. If we were to have runaway or ruinous inflation, the economic cost of that inflation would be as much as the economic loss if Hitler and Mussolini and Hirohito had won this war. In other words, we have as much to lose from an economic standpoint in ruinous inflation as we had to lose from an economic standpoint by the loss of the war. So it is a real challenge to us.

PRICES FAIRLY WELL HELD

I desire to invite your attention to the fact that a fairly good job has been done by holding up the value of the dollar during this, the greatest of all wars. It was the first time during this war that any major power on earth ever attempted to control prices effectively and prevent ruinous inflation. It is the only time in history that a great power like our own has succeeded substantially in doing just that. However, we can study the past and discover that after every major war in history there has invariably been—not most of the time but every time—invariably there has always been a big boom and then a bust; a boom and a collapse.

It is our duty as Members of Congress to be watchmen for the people. As watchmen for the people we should be working daily in the direction of doing something that would prevent happening what has always happened after every major war in the past.

When this war commenced we enacted a price-control law, a stabilization act. Possibly mistakes were made; possibly we could have had different provisions in it or it could have been attempted in a different way; maybe the way we started was clumsy, maybe it was difficult to do, and maybe other ways would have been better, but I want to picture out to you today how successful that law has been. Let us consider the value of the dollar before the war in Europe commenced in 1939 as worth 100 cents. When war broke out in Europe we commenced to have a little inflation and the value of the dollar over here went down to 98 cents. Then it went down to 97 cents; but in December 1941 war was declared, at least war commenced here with our own country, and the value of the dollar slipped to 89 cents on the 100-cent dollar. Then we went ahead in September of 1942 and passed the Stabilization Act, but at that time the dollar had slipped to 84 cents. When the Stabilization Act was passed the dollar slipped to 82 cents. In March 1943 it slipped to 80 cents. Then the President issued his hold-the-line order and since that time, for almost 3 years, lacking less than 2 months, the value of the dollar has slipped down only to 76 cents, 4 cents since the hold-the-line order and 8 cents since the Stabilization Act was passed in September 1942. Losing only 8 cents value on the dollar, I think, is rather successful. But the real challenge is thrown at us now. Will we con-

tinue to hold this dollar at 76 cents or will we permit it to go down to 60 cents, or 50 cents, or 25 cents? That is the greatest battle confronting us today.

Mr. Speaker, I am herewith inserting a table disclosing the purchasing power of the consumer's dollar from August 1939, just prior to the start of the war in Europe, down to the month of November 1945. The dollar's value today is about the same as it was in November 1945. It should be remembered that immediately after World War I the value of the dollar went down to 40 cents; during the War Between the States it went down to 44 cents, and during the Revolutionary War the value of the dollar went down to 33 cents. The table is as follows:

Purchasing power of the consumer's dollar as of August 1939

Year	Month	Value
1939:	August	\$1.00
	September	.98
	December	.99
1940:	March	.99
	June	.98
	September	.98
	December	.98
1941:	March	.97
	June	.94
	September	.91
	December	.89
1942:	March	.86
	June	.85
	September	.84
	December	.82
1943:	March	.80
	June	.79
	September	.80
	December	.79
1944:	March	.80
	June	.79
	September	.78
	December	.78
1945:	March	.78
	June	.76
	September	.77
	October	.77
	November	.76

Not so long ago we were generous and passed a law to increase the amount a veteran and his wife would receive when going to school or college from \$75 a month to \$90. That seemed very generous; but, remember, in fixing it at \$90 a month, a 76-cent dollar was and is used.

The people who will suffer the most by reason of inflation will be the people who work on salaries, who are wage earners, who are living on fixed incomes—people who are getting a certain amount each month—when they go to the market place and find that their dollar will buy less, and less, and less each time; they are the people first to suffer. We have a lot of folks in this country who believe they can outrun inflation. They are rather optimistic, because no one can outrun inflation. Inflation spares no one, but there are a lot of greedy people in this country who want to get rich right quick regardless of the welfare of the public, believing that they can get their money bags full and run off and get away from inflation and not be hurt; but they are just as mistaken as they can be. They will be hit just like all the rest of

us. We can be now on the verge of economic collapse in this country by reason of the danger of ruinous, run-away inflation. I repeat that all other issues, all other problems, are minor in comparison with that one problem.

THE PRESIDENT

I want to commend President Truman for the fine statement he made on that question yesterday in his message to the Congress, and I am going to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope the people of the country will read that statement.

MR. SNYDER

In addition, I want to compliment Mr. John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, for the statement he made along the same lines. I am also inserting that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I hope people will read it. It is something to which we must give consideration.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I am very much interested in the observations of my distinguished friend. I am always interested in what he says about anything. Inflation is our greatest problem. Now, is not inflation caused by lack of production and is not lack of production our greatest problem?

Mr. PATMAN. That is one of the causes, I may say to the gentleman. Lack of production causes a scarcity of goods. A scarcity of goods and lots of money in the pockets of the people to bid on the scarce supply of goods causes the prices of the goods to go up high which in turn causes inflation.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. If we had full production would we be threatened with inflation?

Mr. PATMAN. We would not be, but the problem today is that we have so much money in circulation and so few goods. We need production. That will come nearer getting us away from inflation than any other one thing.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I just rose for information.

Mr. PATMAN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. After the other war we had \$53 per capita in the pockets of the people. That was the highest amount up until then that the people had ever had among them. That caused inflation. Everything went up high. There was a boom like we have after every war. Then there came the collapse which we have always had after every war and like we are trying to prevent now. We have more pressures than we had then. We have over \$200 per capita actual money in the pockets of the people of America today, approximately four times as much as we had after the last war and four times as much as caused the inflation after the last war; bank deposits are in proportion. We do not have the production that we had then. That is the reason I say that we could be on the verge of economic collapse by reason of the great danger of run-away inflation.

RACE BETWEEN WAGES AND PRICES

I hope that we will never see the day when we have a race between wages and prices. That is the first start of inflation in every country. You can study it for yourselves. Someone will feel like they ought to have higher wages, and doubtless they can make a good case for it. They will get higher wages; then, of course, that brings higher prices, and they must have higher prices. Then they need higher wages again and get higher wages, then higher prices. That race between wages and prices causes prices generally to go out through the roof and leads to ruinous inflation. So I hope all sides will take into consideration that it is better to have not so much money and have money that is worth something than to have several times that much and have money that is not worth anything. That matter should be given consideration by all factions, by all sides in all these disputes we are having today.

I like to see people make good wages and get good prices. I know that the salvation of this Nation depends on good wages and good prices. We have a national debt which is higher than the national debt of any country on earth, 10 times as high as it has ever been before this war, with one exception. We have a national debt of \$278,000,000,000. Now, can we pay that debt with a \$40,000,000,000 income like we had in 1932? Of course, we cannot. It would be impossible. We would pay it; yes, but with worthless paper money. That is the way it would be paid. So the only way we can pay our national debt, the only way we can have economic stability in this great country of ours, is to have good prices and good wages, a high national income so that we can pay this high national debt conveniently and without suffering discomforts, and with ease. If we permit that high national income to be reduced we will suffer increasing hardships in our efforts and attempts to pay this high national debt. So I insist that our problem today, our No. 1 problem as outlined in such an effective way by the President of the United States, is preventing ruinous, run-away inflation here at home.

The following statement on the President's policies in specific fields was contained in his message to the Congress of yesterday. It is as follows:

(A) EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL ACT

Today inflation is our greatest immediate domestic problem. So far the fight against inflation has been waged successfully. Since May 1943, following President Roosevelt's hold-the-line order and in the face of the greatest pressures which this country has ever seen, the cost of living index has risen only 3 percent. Wholesale prices in this same period have been held to an increase of 2½ percent.

This record has been made possible by the vigorous efforts of the agencies responsible for this program. But their efforts would have been fruitless if they had not had the solid support of the great masses of our people. The Congress is to be congratulated for its role in providing the legislation under which this work has been carried out.

On VJ-day it was clear to all thinking people that the danger of inflation was by no means over. Many of us can remember vividly our disastrous experience following World

War I. Then the very restricted wartime controls were lifted too quickly, and as a result prices and rents moved more rapidly upward. In the year and a half following the armistice, rents, food, and clothing shot to higher and still higher levels.

When the inevitable crash occurred less than 2 years after the end of the war, business bankruptcies were widespread. Profits were wiped out. Inventory losses amounted to billions of dollars. Farm income dropped by one-half. Factory pay rolls dropped 40 percent, and nearly one-fifth of all our industrial workers were walking the streets in search of jobs. This was a grim greeting, indeed, to offer our veterans who had just returned from overseas.

When I addressed the Congress in September, I emphasized that we must continue to hold the price line until the production of goods caught up with the tremendous demands. Since then we have seen demonstrated the strength of the inflationary pressures which we have to face.

Retail sales in the closing months of 1945 ran 12 percent above the previous peak for that season, which came in 1944. Prices throughout the entire economy have been pressing hard against the price ceilings. The prices of real estate, which cannot now be controlled under the law, are rising rapidly. Commercial rents are not included in the present price-control law and, where they are not controlled by State law, have been increasing, causing difficulties to many businessmen.

It will be impossible to maintain a high purchasing power or an expanding production unless we can keep prices at levels which can be met by the vast majority of our people. Full production is the greatest weapon against inflation, but until we can produce enough goods to meet the threat of inflation the Government will have to exercise its wartime control over prices.

I am sure that the people of the United States are disturbed by the demands made by several business groups with regard to price and rent control.

I am particularly disturbed at the effect such thinking may have on production and employment. If manufacturers continue to hold back goods and decline to submit bids when invited—as I am informed some are doing—in anticipation of higher prices which would follow the end of price controls, we shall inevitably slow down production and create needless unemployment. On the other hand, there are the vast majority of American businessmen who are not holding back goods, but who need certainty about the Government pricing policy in order to fix their own long-range pricing policies.

Businessmen are entitled therefore to a clear statement of the policy of the Government on the subject. Tenants and housewives, farmers and workers—consumers in general—have an equal right.

We are all anxious to eliminate unnecessary controls just as rapidly as we can do so. The steps that we have already taken in many directions toward that end are a clear indication of our policy.

The present Price Control Act expires on June 30, 1946. If we expect to maintain a steady economy we shall have to maintain price and rent control for many months to come. The inflationary pressures on prices and rents, with relatively few exceptions, are now at an all-time peak. Unless the Price Control Act is renewed there will be no limit to which our price levels would soar. Our country would face a national disaster. We cannot wait to renew the act until immediately before it expires. Inflation results from psychological as well as economic conditions. The country has a clear right to know where the Congress stands on this all-important problem. Any uncertainty now as to whether the act will be extended gives rise to price speculation, to withholding of

goods from the market in anticipation of rising prices, and to delays in achieving maximum production.

I do not doubt that the Congress will be beset by many groups who will urge that the legislation that I have proposed should either be eliminated or modified to the point where it is nearly useless. The Congress has a clear responsibility to meet this challenge with courage and determination. I have every confidence that it will do so.

I strongly urge that the Congress now resolve all doubts and as soon as possible adopt legislation continuing rent and price control in effect for a full year from June 30, 1946.

It is my hope that early consideration will be given to the continuation of the Price Control Act. It will be one of the most important proposals to come before this Congress.

The following statement appears in the fifth report of the Honorable John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion:

II. THE RACE AGAINST INFLATION

When Japan fell this Nation faced two seemingly contradictory dangers—on the one hand, deflation due to heavy demobilization, mass lay-offs, and the disappearance of Government markets; and, on the other hand, inflation due to more demand and spending power than there were goods and services to satisfy. Both dangers were present and operating in different parts of our economy. It was uncertain at the outset which would be on the whole the more serious influence on our entire economy.

Developments in the intervening months, as outlined in the preceding section, have demonstrated that the threat of inflation is much the more serious at this time.

The small decline in consumer incomes and the sharp increase in consumer and business expenditures make it certain that for some time lack of demand will not limit the expansion of civilian production. Shortages of properly trained labor in the right places, of raw materials, and of components, along with the other technical and organizational difficulties of conversion will be for some time, as they are at present, the limiting factors.

THE CAUSES OF INFLATION

These technical and organization factors will limit the rate at which output can be increased in response to heavy civilian demand. At the same time they will limit the rate at which additional manpower coming onto the civilian labor market can be absorbed. Thus, the same situation will cause both increasing unemployment during the next several months and continuing heavy inflationary pressures; unemployment and inflationary pressure may be at their height at the same time.

We cannot now predict when output will be sufficient to end the serious threat of inflation.

We do not doubt our ability to prevent inflation; but to do so, it is imperative that we have in the near future an extension of price control authority beyond June 30. It is vital for the prevention of inflation that businessmen and consumers anticipate that prices will remain stable. To provide them this assurance, it is essential that the Congress act well before the expiration date.

Consider the inflationary situation in more detail:

1. Heavy inflationary pressure exists at present: In spite of the moderate war-end drop in income, almost all types of goods are in heavy demand. Retail sales are the highest in our history. Retail prices have maintained their wartime level since VJ-day, contrary to common expectations. Wholesale prices have been creeping upward. Their rise since September has been more rapid than in any similar period since 1943.

2. Acute shortages of many important types of goods cannot possibly be made up in the near future:

Demand for housing, industrial and commercial construction, and the resulting demand for building materials and services, will be far in excess of the maximum output that the construction industry can possibly supply, not only through 1946, but for some time thereafter.

The demand for consumer durable goods will certainly exceed supply through 1946. There are about 4,000,000 fewer cars on American streets and roads today than there were in 1941. Many of those still in use need to be replaced. Also the number of prospective automobile owners has undoubtedly increased in the past 5 years. No matter how successful the automobile industry is in fully mobilizing its resources for production, it cannot possibly satisfy all demands in the coming year.

Demand for certain types of producers' equipment will exceed supply throughout the year. During the war the production of trucks for industry and commercial use was severely curtailed and there is a large backlog of demand. Many kinds of industrial machinery and equipment for textile and printing and food processing industries are in great demand.

Demand for textile products is likewise expected to exceed supply throughout a good part of the year. For some foods such as sugar, high-grade beef, fats and oils, inflationary pressure will persist for many months.

Almost all other important goods and services are now available in quantities too small to meet present demand. During coming months, output for the civilian market will increase, because more manpower will be available. But technical and organizational difficulties will limit the rate of increase.

3. Buying power will be augmented by the extremely large amount of accumulated liquid assets held by business and consumers: The supply of money has expended from \$8,000,000,000 in 1940 to \$28,000,000,000 at the present time. Total cash, plus bank deposits, plus war bonds held by individuals have increased to \$150,000,000,000. Those held by business push the total up to \$220,000,000,000.

These holdings are spotty. Some consumers, especially in low-income groups, have been able to accumulate little or none; nevertheless, the total is large.

These liquid assets can help sustain high levels of production for some time. Or—improperly handled—they can become a charge of dynamite exploding under our price structure. We simply do not know how many consumers will spend these savings. Presumably most will not do so quickly—but if only a small proportion should do so, the result could be disastrous. If only 10 percent of the total were spent during 1946—if say \$15,000,000,000 were added to normal consumer demand out of current income—the result would be an increase in the present level of demand sufficient to increase inflationary pressures greatly.

Under these circumstances, it would be foolhardy not to recognize that the excess of demand over supply throughout the economic system may continue far beyond June 30.

4. A further crucial factor at the present time is the growing business expectation that effective price control will end and prices will rise: Prices on the stock market have risen about 15 percent in the past 10 weeks. Builders report that they are frequently unable to get bids for construction except at a level which includes a generous cushion for anticipated increases in costs. Public and private purchasing agents have, in many cases, been unable to get contracts for future delivery except with escape clauses providing for higher prices.

Such an atmosphere is contagious. The expectation of inflation immediately becomes one of its direct contributing causes. The belief that prices will rise gives businessmen a powerful incentive to buy, hoard inventories, and refuse to sell; it gives consumers a similar incentive to buy more than their current needs. With the volume of liquid savings what it is, a disastrous boom could occur if an inflationary buying rush were to start.

The most dangerous part of the inflation of World War I happened after the war. It was then that we had the disastrous post-war boom and collapse in which everyone suffered. (See chart, Prices, Then and Now.)

The Nation cannot afford to allow history to repeat itself in terms of such a national catastrophe.

Basic conditions the same

All the underlying causes that brought about inflation 25 years ago are with us again now, in accentuated form. People are anxious to buy, the inflationary psychology is conspicuous again.

The events that would follow the premature ending of effective price control can be predicted with considerable certainty.

1. Shortages of both producer and consumer goods would for a time be intensified by the strenuous efforts of businessmen to build up inventories and accelerate purchases of equipment, and in some cases, to hold goods for subsequent sale at higher prices; and by the equally strenuous efforts of consumers to beat the rise in the cost of living. In the scramble for goods, small business concerns would almost inevitably lose out relative to larger concerns.

2. As prices rose, great hardship would be caused to persons who live on pensions or annuities, upon low-income groups, and upon white-collar workers and other workers whose wages or salaries are slower to rise than the cost of living. A substantial part of the wartime saving would be destroyed since war bonds and other forms of accumulated savings of consumers and of business concerns would lose part of their purchasing power.

3. Some businessmen would find their profit margins widened during the boom, but only temporarily. The more effectively they had hoarded goods in speculative anticipation of a price rise, the more profit they would make. But these wider margins would last only as long as the inflationary rise in prices was in progress—and in the end would come collapse.

4. The sharp rise in prices would include a rise in construction costs. This would soon curtail the construction market. Consumers too would after a time curtail buying for lack of purchasing power or in protest at high prices. The incentive to build up inventories would end.

The choking off of these sources of demand would end the boom and almost inevitably cause a collapse, with its fall in income and profits, its severe unemployment, its heavy decline in spending and in production, and its individual and business bankruptcies. (See chart, Boom and Collapse.)

The net effect of these developments, coming on top of the strains of 4 years of war, would be to make enormously more difficult the attainment, of our stated long-run objectives of stability, prosperity, and security.

At the present moment farmers, businessmen, and consumers are less heavily in debt than ever before, and the volume of accumulated savings is greater. There has never been a moment in the history of this country when so few individuals or groups stood to gain from inflation and when so many would be permanently injured.

Taxes cannot do the job alone

There are those who say that the proper preventive for a boom at this time is fiscal policy alone—that price controls should be

lifted and taxes levied heavily enough to drain off excessive demand.

Certainly heavy taxes should be retained during 1946. But reducing the general level of demand is singularly inappropriate as an anti-inflation policy during the transition period, for three reasons:

1. Even if the consequences of vigorous deflationary fiscal policy were desirable, it would be extremely difficult to judge what measures to apply, in view of the enormous volume of savings in the hands of individuals and corporations, and in view of the rapid changes in conditions during the transition. Annual changes in tax rates would be far too slow to meet the changing situation.

2. We need to maintain the pressure of demand in order to stimulate an expansion in production and employment. This is important not only in helping us reach full production and full employment quickly, but also in maintaining it later on.

3. Most important, in the spotty situation facing us, any general reduction of demand would create serious unemployment and human misery before it reduced inflationary pressure sufficiently to make price controls unnecessary. The excess of demand over supply will vary enormously between industries. Under conditions in which demand for food would equal supply, demand for housing or automobiles would be far above the supply. To eliminate inflationary pressure in these latter fields, it would be necessary to reduce general demand to depression levels and create mass unemployment.

Price control extension a necessity

Conditions during the remainder of the transition will be so spotty that only direct price controls, which can be retained where needed and lifted where not needed, will meet the situation. Price controls remain our only bulwark against inflation until production can increase sufficiently to balance demand, since other restrictions that formerly limited demand have been largely removed—consumer rationing and allocation controls over the whole structure of production. Present price-control authority expires on June 30. But if people thought that price control would end at June 30, compliance and enforcement would deteriorate sometime before that date.

Enforcement staffs are far too small to police all prices and all establishments. Price control depends on full public cooperation. With price control expected to end, that cooperation and the effectiveness of control can be expected to end well in advance of the legal date.

Furthermore, in anticipation of the removal of price-control authority while inflationary pressures still existed, goods would inevitably be withheld from the market on a large scale, thus intensifying the pressures. We have had some indication within recent weeks of inventory accumulation in anticipation of the removal of the excess-profits tax. How extensive this has been is unknown, but we must face the fact that withholding of goods from the market would be far greater if the abrupt ending of price control were in immediate prospect.

For these reasons, we cannot safely anticipate that price stability will be maintained, unless the authority to control prices beyond June 30 is granted at an early date. I urge, the Congress to act promptly to forestall any possibility of a breakdown in price control. The very knowledge that price ceilings will not end will be a powerful stabilizing force.

I can promise that as soon as the pressure on prices in any field eases—as soon as supply can meet demand—controls in that field will be lifted. Part II of this report summarizes the speed with which we have removed controls of many kinds—including some over prices—between VJ-day and the present. We will apply in the future the same principle of removing regulations as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], is recognized for 25 minutes.

COMMUNISTS WERE COMMISSIONED IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, if there are any on this floor who find themselves in doubt about anything that I shall say in the time allotted to me by the House, they will have no quarrel with me. Their quarrel will be with the records of our Government.

We are in a serious crisis in our country. It is an hour when plain words must be spoken. Truly we are confronted with a time when—

Treason, like a deadly blight, comes o'er the councils of the brave, and blasts them in their hour of might.

A few short months ago we were hailing the triumph of our armed forces over the might of Nazi Germany. Today we find the splendid Army we built up, at the cost of much blood, sweat, and tears, threatening to fall apart as the result of a lack of foresight on the one hand, and neglect, almost amounting to treachery, on the other.

I am in sympathy with the legitimate grievances of the men remaining in the armed forces, who are, in many cases, the victims of official stupidity and incompetence. We all know that the demobilization plan is not perfect. I do not want the Communist press to warp or twist my remarks as a smear or criticism of our gallant fighting men, it is not so intended. I believe that a shrewd and well-organized Communist conspiracy has seized upon these grievances to exploit them at the precise moment of the London Conference in order to disintegrate our armed forces, to paralyze our foreign policy and further the interests of Soviet aggression throughout the world. My conviction is based upon the following provable facts:

First. The records show that the ring-leaders of the GI demonstrations in Honolulu were, in a number of instances, men with Communist records such as Herbert Freeman and David Livingston of New York.

Second. The statements presented by alleged GI representatives were in some cases not bona fide GI grievances but attacks upon so-called American imperialism reminiscent of the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact and recent Communist demonstrations before the State Department.

Third. The five demands presented by a so-called GI committee of liberation in Paris on January 13, 1946, calling for the abolition of officers' privileges in mess halls, clubs, recreation centers, and living quarters, and the reform of court-martial boards, is fully in line with the program drawn up for Communists in all countries by the Communist International at its Sixth World Congress, July-August 1928. Similar demands, presented by soldiers' committees or councils were utilized to cause the disintegration of the imperial Russian armies during the First World War. They are demands which would be met by a firing squad in the Red Army today.

Fourth. Communist-dominated unions, like the National Maritime Union, which sounded the Communist keynote at every turn of the party line, announcing that "the Yanks are not coming" during Stalin's partnership with Hitler, calling for the opening of a second front after Russia was attacked by Hitler, are now demanding the we "bring the GI's home." The union pulled a 1-day strike in support of its demand.

Fifth. The labor canteen in Honolulu, which has been a hotbed of Communist propaganda among the soldiers stationed in the vicinity, is today the headquarters of the so-called Oahu servicemen's committee for speedier demobilization. The head of this canteen is Ewart G. Guinier, a well-known New York Communist fired by the New York Civil Service Commission in June 1942.

Sixth. A study made by Mr. Charles T. Lucey for the Scripps-Howard papers on January 17, 1946, shows that the Communist press has been giving enthusiastic support to the disaffection of American troops in all theaters. The following are sample excerpts from these papers:

GI's suspicious of foreign policy—American troops don't want to be used to stifle Korean independence—Stop intervention in China.

Reports thus far indicate that the War Department has been caught completely unprepared for the present emergency despite the fact that the press, patriotic groups and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle raised their voices in warning more than a year ago, only to be brushed aside by topflight officials of the War Department with an arrogance which equalled their reckless stupidity. I wonder if these trusting gentlemen knew that as far back as 1920, V. I. Lenin, the outstanding teacher and guide of the Communist movement, counseled his followers throughout the world "to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge" in order to accomplish their goal of world revolution. I wonder if they are aware of the fact that Communist "contacts in Government research offices, military as well as civil" are instructed "to submit reports" and that "they are being sent to the Soviet Government"—State of New York, Legislative Document No. 49, 1942, pages 131, 132. For the sake of the record I wish to recall these warnings and the statements made in reply.

First. In October 1943 the New York World-Telegram carried a series of articles by Frederick Woltman revealing that Army trainees were being indoctrinated with Communist teachings, despite the War Department directive that each Army trainee "should be thoroughly impressed throughout the course with a sense of personal responsibility which rests upon him to preserve and strengthen the American way of life." Assurances were given by the Cornell authorities that the situation "will be corrected" but no fundamental change was made. "Military authorities fooled," read the World-Telegram editorial of December 29, 1943, forewarning the present disaster.

Second. On May 23, 1944, the attention of the Senate Military Affairs Com-

mittee was called to instructions issued by Lt. Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, Deputy Chief of Staff, to forward all espionage, sabotage, and subversive files to Washington for their destruction. General McNarney characterized such material as useless files. Senators denounced this proposal as treason. Today we find this self-same officer booted and defied by the very elements whom he wittingly or unwittingly sought to protect. Were it not that all of us are today the victims of such inexcusable stupidity or worse, we might call this poetic justice indeed.

It should be noted in this connection that Mr. George F. Schwarzwald, an analyst for the Budget Bureau, has been largely instrumental in exerting official pressure upon the Army, the Navy and other intelligence services for the dismantling of subversive files. In a number of cases he was successful. His peculiar interest in subversive files has never been satisfactorily explained. Nevertheless this individual is now mentioned as a possible successor for that peerless guardian of our national security, J. Edgar Hoover.

Third. On February 19, 1945, Walter Trohan of the Chicago Tribune made public the fact that the War Department had issued—

A directive to all commanding officers at home, behind the lines and at battle fronts, stating that there shall no longer be any distinction between Communists and Americans in the United States Army. The directive was issued under date of December 30, 1944. * * * It was signed at the direction of the Secretary of War by Brigadier General Dunlop, acting adjutant general of the Army. * * * From October 30 to the date of the issuance of the directive the department had approved 200 Communist commission applications without rejecting one. * * * This directive stands in sharp contrast to the Hatch Act.

The article called attention to the fact that Communists were thus free to enter highly confidential and sensitive services in the armed forces.

On February 22, 1945, the Adjutant General, Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio, wrote to me explaining the procedure which has now borne such tragic fruit. He pleaded the virtual impossibility of developing actual, legal proof of membership in the Communist Party on the part of persons desiring to conceal such membership, thereby publicly acknowledging the utter inability of the Army Intelligence Services to protect the armed forces against subversion, which is their sacred responsibility under the laws of the land. Labor unions and other organizations without the tremendous resources at the disposal of the War Department have little trouble in locating Communists and their agents, in their midst.

He protested that the Communist Party has given members leaves of absence to prevent the application of the Hatch Act. Apparently the general was completely hoodwinked by the party's policy of evasion and subterfuge. In 1940 the party resorted to similar tactics of severing its connections with the Communist International in order to evade the provisions of the Voorhis Act. But its subservience to Moscow direction did not diminish one iota thereafter.

It is more than curious that the tactics of the Communists in the armed forces in various parts of the globe have followed the party line everywhere with perfect regularity and synchronization. The evidence points to the conclusion that Communists "on leave of absence" in the armed forces were in constant touch with their directive centers through their own channels operating under the noses of the Army Intelligence, in accordance with the principles once laid down by Earl Browder in his authoritative pamphlet, *A Talk About the Communist Party*, as follows:

When you go about your work, no matter what it may be * * * you should always go about it with that understanding, that you are acting as a representative of the Communist Party.

Again the Army was fooled.

Ingenuously the directive of December 30, 1944, made public by Adjutant General Ulio, declared in defending the soundness of the War Department policy that "persons in the Army suspected of, but not proven to be Communists, had not proved to be any source of difficulty." Evidently General Ulio and the War Department were not aware of the fact that the Communists were willing to cooperate with the American Government only as long as we were an ally of Russia, and that once the party line changed again, as it has officially on July 26-28, 1944, because Russia feels that we are no longer at war as allies, they would use every vantage point to obstruct and destroy our democracy. We may confidently expect that Communists now occupying sensitive posts to which they were admitted in accordance with the War Department directive of December 30, 1944, will do everything in their power to utilize their positions for subversive purposes. That is the present party line. The recent Communist-led GI demonstrations prove that the Department has sown the wind and is now reaping the whirlwind.

Not only did the Army admit Communists to sensitive posts, as will be later shown, but it lavished innumerable decorations upon them, which they are now exploiting to give prominence to the propaganda of the Communist Party. The following examples are illustrative:

Staff Sgt. Joseph Clark, alias for Joseph Cohen, awarded a silver star by Lt. Gen. Wade H. Maislip, commanding general of the United States Seventh Army, announced as joining the staff of the *Daily Worker* as editor of veterans' affairs. He was formerly organizer of the Young Communist League in Detroit and editor of the *Review*, Young Communist League publication. (*Daily Worker*, January 18, 1946, p. 8.)

Capt. Irving Goff, formerly with the Office of Strategic Services, awarded * * * is now director of the New York State Veterans' Commission of the Communist Party. (*Daily Worker*, January 15, 1946, p. 3.)

Staff Sgt. Robert Thompson awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, now vice president of the Communist Party. (*Worker*, June 11, 1944, p. 3.)

Many additional examples could be cited.

The statement made by the gentleman from Michigan, Representative SHAFER, minority member of the House Military

Affairs Committee, on February 21, 1945, is almost prophetic. He asked:

Does anyone believe that if, tomorrow, the line of the Soviet Union should change against the American Government that the Communists in this country would not change overnight as they did on several previous occasions?

But the War Department would give no heed to this warning.

Fourth. On February 27, 1945, Maj. Gen. Clayton Bissell, head of the Army Intelligence, told a House Committee on Military Affairs:

I know of no case of any man who was ever a member [of the Communist Party] who has ever been commissioned.

On the same day Assistant Secretary John J. McCloy declared before this body that—

The Army has not knowingly appointed as officers any individuals who seek overthrow of the Government, or whose disloyalty has been otherwise established, and it does not propose to do so.

On July 19, 1945, the subcommittee of the House Committee on Military Affairs released a list of 16 commissioned and noncommissioned Army officers as having backgrounds which reflect communism. This list included Maj. Edward Newhouse, Capt. Herbert Aptheker, Capt. Horace Warner Truesdell, Lt. Richard C. Criley, Lt. Irving Fajans, Lt. Edward W. Finkelstein, Lt. Irving Goff, Lt. Vincent Lossowski, Lt. Jerry Trauber, Lt. Milton Wolff, Lt. Gerald Cook, and others. Prior to this on March 4, 1945, Earl Browder had substantiated the conclusions of the subcommittee by declaring through the *Daily Worker*:

Of course there are Communists holding commissions in the United States Army.

Six days before Bissell said they were not. Evidently he had been in contact with his comrades despite their "leave of absence," and despite the Army intelligence. I believe these officers are now exploiting their Army titles to further activities of the Communist Party at meetings and in the Communist press.

These developments show that Major General Bissell and Assistant Secretary of War McCloy either did not know what they were talking about or they were unknowingly deceiving the American people. The fact remains that the harm they have done is incalculable.

Fifth. Every conceivable device was employed to defend and cover up those in the War Department responsible for the directive of December 30, 1944, whose impeachment Congressman RANKIN suggested to this House on February 19, 1945, referring to their conduct as treason or very close to it. In a letter addressed to Representative THOMASON, chairman of the House Military Affairs subcommittee, Secretary of War Stimson arbitrarily refused to disclose the files on individuals charged with having subversive records—*Times-Herald*, March 14, 1945, page 2.

General Bissell stoutly insisted that—

Each [Communist] has sworn loyalty to the United States, and this record indicates that they have kept that oath. Instead of advocating the overthrow of the Government

by force and violence, they are engaged in upholding it by force and violence.

The naive General Bissell evidently was not aware of the fact that Communists take such oaths with tongue in cheek. Let the general dare to appear before this House and stand by his statement now in the light of the events of recent weeks. Intelligence officers are expected to have foresight—and intelligence.

Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, Director of the Office of Strategic Services, the special spy system which has been so profusely publicized in recent months, presented before the House subcommittee as his considered judgment the theory that "overthrow of the Government by violence is not advocated by Communists today." Army records will show that recent Communist-inspired demonstrations have resorted to force and violence in accord with fundamental Communist doctrine. Violence characterizes Communist-led strikes now raging from coast to coast. The Communists are openly agitating for a national general strike at the present moment. Abroad Communists have taken over country after country by unashamed resort to force and violence. In the light of recent events throughout the world it is difficult to conceive how anyone, let alone a top-flight intelligence officer, could be guilty of such lack of foresight and judgment.

When the names of David Zablodowsky, Alexander Vuchinich, and other Communists occupying key posts in the Office of Strategic Services were cited, General Donovan said he was personally satisfied that they were loyal. Men like these, it should be remembered, have since been blanketed into the War and State Departments by Executive order to continue their nefarious activity.

Sixth. Material presented before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Military Affairs on March 4, 1945, showed that "Soviet propaganda in subtle form is being fed to American troops by Communists who have secured editorial staff positions on Army newspapers"—*Times-Herald*, March 4, 1945, pages 1, 2. Among those engaged in this activity were the following individuals with provable Communist records: Dashiell Hammett, Lyle Dowling, Walter Bernstein, DeWitt Gilpin, and others. In charge of this work was that worldly liberal, Maj. Gen. Frederick H. Osborn, who boasted that his division produced "1,500,000 daily sales of Stars and Stripes—2,600,000 weekly sales of Yank—the 179 radio stations in the armed forces radio service—a million men taking correspondence courses, and another 4,000,000 attending command schools." The poison produced on this mass scale for our troops was characterized recently by Westbrook Pegler as follows:

When this war came along, however, the Communists and pinks first promoted a great expansion of such journalism and then contrived to plant themselves in the publications, as data in Army Intelligence has positively noted.

Articles in these papers eulogized the Soviet Union and its institutions and

disparaged those of the United States in comparison. High tribute was paid to Communist-led unions like the National Maritime Union and the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union which are paying the way for a revolutionary general strike in the United States at this moment.

In fact, a Communist gossip sheet, in its issue of August 27, 1945, described with considerable satisfaction some of the 74 pamphlets prepared by the Information and Education Division, Army Service Forces, under Maj. Gen. F. H. Osborn, and issued to 175,000 education and information officers of the United States Army to be used in every training camp and in every unit abroad, and all passed by official censors. In fact quoted the following notable excerpts from these Army fact sheets:

No. 8: Certainly be cautious—certainly keep in mind the fact that ours is not a perfect democracy. * * *

No. 53: Soviet: We commonly use this word to designate what was formerly called Russia. It actually means "council" in Russian. * * * Socialist: They are "Socialist" Republics because they are organized along the lines of a system in which the means for the production (such as factories, mines, and utilities) and distribution of wealth are the collective property of the workers. * * * He (the Russian) was proud and reassured because the Russian state owned all the productive wealth and he no longer felt exploited by a ruling class.

No. 53: On its record, the Soviet policy has had a clear and realistic aim. * * * After Munich in September, 1938, pursuing its realistic policies, the Soviet looked to its own protection. Among its actions was moving into Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and into Poland.

Seventh. The policy of the War Department drew the following well-merited criticism from Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion:

Fifty-one percent loyalty is not enough when the security of our country is at stake. * * * The lives of our sons, the vital military secrets of our armed forces, must not be entrusted to men of divided loyalty. * * * The Attorney General of the United States has held that the purpose of the Communist Party is the overthrow of the Government of the United States. * * * Every Communist, as a condition of membership in the party, swears supreme loyalty to the party and to the revolution. (New York Times, March 2, 1945, p. 5.)

But Earl Browder, at that time leader of the Communist movement, indicated not only his full cognizance of what was being cooked up but his enthusiastic approval, as demonstrated by his statement in the Daily Worker of March 4, 1945, from which I quote:

The United States Army kills the Red bogey. * * * This is, indeed, a great victory for American democracy. It has been the studied policy of American Communists to refrain from public discussion of this issue. * * * We soon became convinced that the Army leadership was soundly democratic and that, from its own experience, it would move to modify * * * anti-Communist rules. * * * Our judgment has been confirmed * * * and we are today happy, indeed, that the progress being recorded did not require any organized pressure upon the armed forces from outside their own ranks. * * * It is time to bring Attorney General

Biddle and the Department of Justice into line with the War Department and the State Department—as well as with the President, who has learned the value of rubbing elbows with Communists.

I, for one, would like to know who gave Mr. Browder assurance of the abolition of anti-Communist rules.

In recalling these facts it is not my purpose to enter into partisan bickering or recrimination. It is, rather, my intention to bring out in their full proportion the disastrous mistakes which have been made in the past, the consequences of which we all face in common today, and to indicate what must be done if we are to save our Republic from destruction. Let every true American, regardless of party, take heed. I therefore propose the following immediate steps:

First. Effective measures to correct the legitimate grievances of our armed forces with all possible speed.

Second. The complete scrapping of the previous Army information machinery which has borne such evil results and its replacement by a sound program placed in the hands of loyal Americans. Our soldiers are loyal and true Americans. They are willing to serve their country loyally if they know exactly what is wanted of them. The men should be told the real facts in the present international situation and all previous fictions should be discarded. We should work out a clear foreign policy with an effective military program to implement it and inform the men in the ranks, and the country as a whole.

Third. All Communists, including outright members and those accepting Communist Party discipline and instruction, should be weeded out and placed where they can no longer carry out their subversive activities. Army discipline should be enforced. The men in the ranks should be informed of the nature of the insidious forces seeking to operate among them.

Fourth. The Army intelligence services should be revamped to meet the present situation.

Fifth. It should be recognized that the disruptive activities of the Communists in the Army and in our industries, in accordance with the new revolutionary line of the Communist Party, will be supplemented by Communists and their agents within the Government itself. Cognizance should be taken of the present proceedings before the United States Supreme Court seeking to invalidate the Hatch Act. The limitations of this act should be examined. The proper committees of this House should take up at once the enactment of effective legislation barring from Government employment all subversive elements.

The time to act is now. It is later than we think.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ENGLE of California, for 6 days, on account of official business.

LABOR COMMITTEE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Labor Committee of the

House, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 4437).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOYLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the steel strike and include two items from a Washington newspaper.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 23, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will meet on Wednesday, January 23, 1946, at 10:30 a. m., in executive session. The Attorney General, Mr. Clark, will attend.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold hearings on H. R. 4781 on Thursday and Friday mornings, January 24 and 25, 1946, at 10 o'clock.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Securities Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m. on Thursday, January 24, 1946, for resumption of hearings in study of operations pursuant to the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing on Wednesday, January 30, 1946, on the bill (H. R. 2710) to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland. The hearing will begin at 10 a. m., and will be held in the Judiciary Committee Room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

968. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

969. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 86 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension;

to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

970. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947, in the amount of \$1,500,000, for the Panama Canal, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 417); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. Senate Concurrent Resolution 43. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack; without amendment (Rept. No. 1483). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HENDRICKS: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5201. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 765. An act concerning the establishment of meteorological observation stations in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere for the purpose of improving the weather-forecasting service within the United States and on the civil international air transport routes from the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 301. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 30 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on Labor. H. R. 4437. A bill to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 5202. A bill to protect employees and employers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 5203. A bill to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce; to diminish unemployment; to establish a national policy for assuring continuing employment in a free competitive economy and to protect the right to work; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 5204. A bill to provide for a proposed system for retirement of members of the Reserve forces of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 5205. A bill relating to the base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 5206. A bill to establish a Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 490. Resolution providing additional compensation for certain employees in the Office of the Doorkeeper; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. Res. 491. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the policy of the War Department retarding demobilization; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. Res. 492. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4437, a bill to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 5207. A bill for the relief of the Gluckin Corp.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 5208. A bill for the relief of Michael J. Keaveney and Mary C. Keaveney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 5209. A bill for the relief of Archie A. Plante and Earl T. Creech; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 5210. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yvonne Nguyen-Thi-Tung Rogoff; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5211. A bill for the relief of Lorraine E. Graus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 5212. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Cecil M. Foxworth, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5213. A bill for the relief of G. B. Gardner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RYTER:

H. R. 5214. A bill for the relief of John Petrizzo; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1481. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of Mr. Herbert R. Wallenbrock and numerous representative citizens of St. Charles, Mo., relative to redeployment and demobilization; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1482. Also, petition of Mrs. Elmer Koch and numerous representative citizens of St. Charles, Mo., relative to redeployment and demobilization; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1483. By Mr. EATON: Resolution of the New Jersey Bar Association, protesting against curtailing of jurisdiction of the several district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1484. Also, resolution of the Association of the Sons of Poland, approving adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 109; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1485. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of 283 citizens of San Francisco and other parts of California, urging the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 89, which reads as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby express itself that anti-Semitism

and other forms of hate propaganda directed against racial or religious groups, which arrays creed against creed, and race against race, is a potent weapon in the hands of the enemies of this country and of its institutions; that the spreading of this Hitlerite ideology destroys the unity of this Nation, creates discord among our people, and is a threat to our future peace and security. Whosoever conducts or participates in such propaganda is un-American and is undermining the foundations upon which our Nation was founded, therefore, there can be no place in the lives or thoughts of true Americans for such ideology."

To the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1946

(Legislative day of Friday, January 18, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who sustainest man's spirit by an undying hope, our faint and feeble petitions mock any poor attempts to voice the desperate cry of our lives for Thee. We acknowledge the supreme need that our character and our caliber be greatened to match the demands of this time for spacious thinking. Help us to know that all gracious service in life's brief span is based on the gentleness which makes for greatness; on patience which endureth to the end; on truth which alone makes us free; and on toil which takes all, yet gives all. We pray not to be saved from the earthly ills to which flesh is heir, but we ask that above all there may be given us the enabling grace that we may never betray for expediency's sake the high solemnities of duty which are the very breath of our integrity. In the name of the Redeemer who endured the cross, despising the shame. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 473) relating to pay and allowances of officers of the retired list of the Regular Navy and Coast Guard performing active duty in the rank of rear admiral, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3243. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes";

H. R. 3580. An act to authorize municipalities and public-utility districts in the Territory of Alaska to issue revenue bonds for public-works purposes;